arXiv:0705.3280v1 [math.OA] 23 May 2007

GENERALIZED CCR FLOWS

MASAKI IZUMI AND R. SRINIVASAN

Abstract. We introduce a new construction of E_0-semigroups, called generalized CCR flows, with two kinds of descriptions: those arising from sum systems and those arising from pairs of C_0-semigroups. We get a new necessary and sufficient condition for them to be of type III, when the associated sum system is of finite index. Using this criterion, we construct examples of type III E_0-semigroups, which can not be distinguished from E_0-semigroups of type I by the invariants introduced by Boris Tsirelson. Finally, by considering the local von Neumann algebras, and by associating a type III factor to a given type III E_0-semigroup, we show that there exist uncountably many type III E_0-semigroups in this family, which are mutually non-cocycle conjugate.

1. Introduction

An E_0-semigroup is a weakly continuous semigroup of unital $*$-endomorphisms on $\mathbb{B}(H)$, the algebra of all bounded operators on a separable Hilbert space H. E_0-semigroups are classified into three broad categories, namely type I, II, and III, depending upon the existence of intertwining semigroups called units. William Arveson completely classified the E_0-semigroups of type I, by showing that the CCR flows exhaust all the type I E_0-semigroups, up to the identification of cocycle conjugacy ([5]). But the theory of E_0-semigroups belonging to type II and type III remained mysterious for quite some time. There is no hope of completely classifying the whole class of E_0-semigroups even now, basically due to the presence of type II and type III examples.

For quite sometime there were essentially only one example for each type II and type III E_0-semigroups, due to R. T. Powers ([14], [15]). In this context Boris Tsirelson produced uncountable families of both type II and type III E_0-semigroups by using measure type spaces arising from several models in probability theory ([18]). It is equivalent to study the product systems of Hilbert spaces, a complete invariant introduced by Arveson, in order to understand the associated E_0-semigroups. Tsirelson basically produced uncountable families of both type II and type III product systems of Hilbert spaces.

Tsirelson's construction of type III product systems uses off white noises, which are Gaussian generalized (i.e. distribution valued) processes with a slight correlation between "past and future". After discussing Tsirelson's results, Arveson concludes

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L55, 30D55, 81S05.

Key words and phrases. E_0-semigroups, CCR Flows, Type III, Unilateral Shift, Hilbert-Schmidt.

Work supported by JSPS.

his book ([5]) by saying, 'It is clear that we have not achieved a satisfactory understanding of the existence of 'logarithms' in the category of product systems.' This was clarified for Tsirelson's type III examples in [6] from the viewpoint of operator algebras. Inspired by the results of Tsirelson, a purely operator algebraic construction of Tsirelson's type III examples was provided in [6]. They were called as 'product systems arising from sum systems'. In particular, a dichotomy result about types was proved in [6], namely, it was proved that the product system arising from a divisible sum system is either of type I or of type III. A sum system is said to be divisible if it has sufficiently many real and imaginary addits (called additive cocycles in [6]).

On the other hand, motivated by Tsirelson's construction of type III examples, a class of C_0-semigroups acting on $L^2(0,\infty)$, which are Hilbert-Schmidt perturbations of the unilateral shift semigroup, was investigated in [10]. Description of such semigroups in terms of analytic functions on the right-half plane was given and several examples were constructed.

In this paper we discuss the consequences of these developments. First we describe the E_0-semigroups associated with the above mentioned product systems arising from sum systems. This would generalize the simplest kind of E_0-semigroups called CCR flows. These generalized CCR flows are given by a pair of C_0-semigroups. By studying the product system we get a new necessary and sufficient condition for the E_0-semigroup to be of type III, when the associated sum system is of finite index. This criterion is much more powerful than the sufficient condition already proved in [6].

Using the results proved in [10], we compute the additive cocycles for the pairs of the shift semigroup and its perturbations, and show that the sum systems associated with them are always divisible. This class of sum systems include those coming from off white noises of Tsirelson. Then we concentrate on a special subclass of C_0-semigroups, which give rise to new type III E_0-semigroups. These new examples cannot be distinguished from type I E_0-semigroups by the invariants introduced by Tsirelson, and later discussed in [6]. Let us give an intuitive explanation of this phenomenon in terms of Tsirelson's off white noise picture here. Although our examples also come from Tsirelson's off white noises, spectral density functions for them tend to 1 at infinity. This means that our off white noises are so close to white noise that Tsirelson's invariant can not work for them.

Finally, we associate a type III factor as an invariant to each of these type III E_0-semigroups, and using that we prove that there are uncountably many examples in this family which are not cocycle conjugate to each other. Toeplitz operator plays an essential role throughout these discussions.

We end this section by reviewing some of the very basic definitions about E_0-semigroups. For the definitions of notions related to E_0-semigroups, such as cocycle conjugacy, index etc., we refer to [5]. A unit for an E_0-semigroup $\{\alpha_t\}$ acting on $\mathbb{B}(H)$ is a strongly continuous semigroup of bounded operators $\{T_t\}$, which intertwines α and the identity, that is

$$\alpha_t(X)T_t = T_tX, \ \forall\ A \in \mathbb{B}(H), \ t \geq 0.$$

Product systems, a complete invariant for cocycle conjugacy introduced by Arveson, are demonstrated to be a very useful tool in studying E_0-semigroups. For an E_0-semigroup $\{\alpha_t; t \geq 0\}$ these are Hilbert spaces of the intertwining operators $\{H_t; t \geq 0\}$, defined by

$$H_t = \{T \in \mathbb{B}(H); \alpha_t(X)T = TX, \ \forall \ X \in \mathbb{B}(H)\}$$

with inner product $\langle T, S\rangle 1_H = S^*T$ (see [5]). Every notion related to E_0-semigroups can be translated into the framework of the associated product systems. We provide here a slightly different (but equivalent) definition than originally defined in [4] and [5]. The difference is in the measurability axiom (and we do not need a separate non-triviality axiom), which is due to Volkmar Liebcher. He has also proved in [12] that any two measurable structures on a given algebraic product system give rise to isomorphic product systems, and as a consequence we get that two product systems are isomorphic if they are algebraically isomorphic. So we need not consider measurable structures while dealing with isomorphism of product systems.

Definition 1.1. A product system of Hilbert spaces is an one parameter family of separable complex Hilbert spaces $\{H_t; t \geq 0\}$, together with unitary operators

$$U_{s,t} : H_s \otimes H_t \ \mapsto H_{s+t} \text{ for } s, t \in (0, \infty),$$

satisfying the following two axioms of associativity and measurability.

(i) (Associativity) For any $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in (0, \infty)$

$$U_{s_1,s_2+s_3}(1_{H_{s_1}} \otimes U_{s_2,s_3}) = U_{s_1+s_2,s_3}(U_{s_1,s_2} \otimes 1_{H_{s_3}}).$$

(ii) (Measurability) There exists a countable set H^0 of sections $R \ni t \to h_t \in H_t$ such that $t \mapsto \langle h_t, h'_t\rangle$ is measurable for any two $h, h' \in H^0$, and the set $\{h_t; h \in H^0\}$ is total in H_t, for each $t \in (0, \infty)$. Further it is also assumed that the map $(s, t) \mapsto \langle U_{s,t}(h_s \otimes h_t), h'_{s+t}\rangle$ is measurable for any two $h, h' \in H^0$.

Definition 1.2. Two product systems $(\{H_t\}, \{U_{s,t}\})$ and $(\{H'_t\}, \{U'_{s,t}\})$ are said to be isomorphic if there exists a unitary operator $V_t : H_t \mapsto H'_t$, for each $t \in (0, \infty)$ satisfying

$$V_{s+t}U_{s,t} = U'_{s,t}(V_s \otimes V_t).$$

Definition 1.3. A unit for product system is a non-zero section $\{u_t; t \geq 0\}$, such that the map $t \mapsto \langle u_t, h_t\rangle$ is measurable for any $h \in H^0$ and

$$U_{s,t}(u_s \otimes u_t) = u_{s+t}, \ \forall s, t \in (0, \infty).$$

A product system (E_0-semigroup) is said to be of type I, if units exists for the product system and they generate the product system, i.e. for any fixed $t \in (0, \infty)$, the set

$$\{u^1_{t_1}u^2_{t_2}\cdots u^n_{t_n}; \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i = t, u^i \in \mathcal{U}\},$$

is a total set in H_t, where $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of all units and the product is defined as the image of $u^1_{t_1} \otimes u^2_{t_2} \cdots \otimes u^n_{t_n}$ in H_t, under the canonical unitary given by the associativity axiom. It is of type II if units exist but they do not generate the product system. We say a product system to be of type III or unitless if there does not exist any unit for the product system.

2. Preliminaries and notation

In this section we fix the notation used in this paper, recall some of the results proved earlier and make a few definitions. For an operator A, we denote the range of A by $\mathrm{Ran}\,(A)$ and the kernel of A by $\mathrm{Ker}\,(A)$. We denote the identity operator on a Hilbert space H by 1_H (or simply by 1 if no confusion arises).

For a complex Hilbert space K, we denote by $\Gamma(K)$ the symmetric Fock space associated with K, and by Φ the vacuum vector in $\Gamma(K)$ (see [13]). For any $x \in K$, the exponential vector of x is defined by

$$e(x) = \oplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{\otimes^n}}{\sqrt{n!}},$$

where $x^0 = \Phi$. Then the set of all exponential vectors $\{e(x) : x \in K\}$ is a linearly independent total set in $\Gamma(K)$. For a unitary $U \in \mathbb{B}(K)$, we denote by $\mathrm{Exp}\,(U)$ the unitary in $\mathbb{B}(\Gamma(K))$ given by $\mathrm{Exp}\,(U)e(x) = e(Ux)$. The Weyl operator, corresponding to an element $x \in K$, is defined by,

$$W(x)(e(y)) = e^{-\frac{\|x\|^2}{2} - \langle y,x\rangle} e(y+x),$$

and $W(x)$ extends to a unitary operator on $\Gamma(K)$. The $*$-algebra generated by $\{W(x)\}_{x\in K}$ is called the Weyl algebra for K.

For a real Hilbert space G, we denote the complexification of G by $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. For two Hilbert spaces G_1, G_2, define

$$\mathcal{S}(G_1, G_2) = \{A \in \mathbb{B}(G_1, G_2); A \text{ invertible and } I - (A^*A)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ Hilbert-Schmidt}\}.$$

In the above definition and elsewhere, by invertibility we mean that the inverse is also bounded. The set $\mathcal{S}(.,.)$ is well behaved with respect to taking inverses, adjoints, products, and restrictions (see [6]). For two real Hilbert spaces G_1, G_2 and $A \in \mathcal{S}(G_1, G_2)$, define a real liner operator $S_A : G_1^{\mathbb{C}} \to G_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ by $S_A(u + iv) = Au + i(A^{-1})^*v$ for $u, v \in G_1$. Then S_A is a symplectic isomorphism between $G_1^{\mathbb{C}}$ and $G_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ (i.e. S_A is a real linear, bounded, invertible map satisfying $\mathrm{Im}\,(\langle S_Ax, S_Ay\rangle) = \mathrm{Im}\,\langle x, y\rangle$ for all $x, y \in G_1^{\mathbb{C}}$, see [13, page 162]). In general S_A is not complex linear, unless A is unitary.

The following theorem, a generalization of Shales theorem, is used to construct the product system from a given sum system in [6].

Theorem 2.1. (i) *Let G_1, G_2 be real Hilbert spaces and $A \in \mathcal{S}(G_1, G_2)$, then there exists a unique unitary operator $\Gamma(A) : \Gamma(G_1^{\mathbb{C}}) \to \Gamma(G_2^{\mathbb{C}})$ such that*

$$\Gamma(A)W(u)\Gamma(A)^* = W(S_A u)\ \forall\ u \in G_1^{\mathbb{C}} \tag{2.1}$$
$$\langle \Gamma(A)\Phi_1, \Phi_2\rangle \in \mathbb{R}^+ \tag{2.2}$$

where Φ_1 *and* Φ_2 *are the vacuum vectors in* $\Gamma(G_1^{\mathbb{C}})$ *and* $\Gamma(G_2^{\mathbb{C}})$ *respectively.*

Conversely, for a given bounded operator $A : G_1 \mapsto G_2$*, if there exists a unitary operator* $\Gamma(A) : \Gamma(G_1^{\mathbb{C}}) \to \Gamma(G_2^{\mathbb{C}})$*, satisfying,* $\Gamma(A)W(u)\Gamma(A)^* = W(S_A u)$*,* $\forall\ u \in G_1^{\mathbb{C}}$ *then* $A \in \mathcal{S}(G_1, G_2)$*.*

(ii) *Suppose* G_1, G_2, G_3 *be three real Hilbert spaces, and* $A \in \mathcal{S}(G_1, G_2),\ B \in \mathcal{S}(G_2, G_3)$*, then*

$$\Gamma(A^{-1}) = \Gamma(A)^* \tag{2.3}$$
$$\Gamma(BA) = \Gamma(B)\Gamma(A) \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. We only have to prove the converse part of (i). Remaining parts are already proved in [6]. For $A \in \mathbb{B}(G_1, G_2)$, consider the polar decomposition of $A = UA_0$, where $A_0 \in \mathbb{B}(G_1)$, and $U \in \mathbb{B}(G_1, G_2)$ a unitary operator. Suppose there exists a unitary operator $\Gamma(A) : \Gamma(G_1^{\mathbb{C}}) \to \Gamma(G_2^{\mathbb{C}})$, satisfying $\Gamma(A)W(u)\Gamma(A)^* = W(S_A u)$, then $\Gamma(A_0) = \text{Exp}\,(U^*)\Gamma(A)$ will satisfy, $\Gamma(A_0)W(u)\Gamma(A_0)^* = W(S_{A_0} u)$. The original version of Shales theorem will imply that $A_0 \in \mathcal{S}(G_1, G_1)$ (see [13, page 169]). So we can conclude that $A \in \mathcal{S}(G_1, G_2)$. □

Next we define the notion of a sum system.

Definition 2.2. A sum system is a two parameter family of real Hilbert spaces $\{G_{s,t}\}$ for $0 < s < t \leq \infty$, satisfying $G_{s,t} \subset G_{s',t'}$ if the interval (s, t) is contained in the interval (s', t'), together with a one parameter semigroup $\{S_t\}$, of bounded linear operators on $G_{(0,\infty)}$ for $t \in (0, \infty)$ such that

(i) $S_s|_{G_{0,t}} \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}, G_{s,s+t})\ \forall\ t \in (0, \infty],\ s \in [0, \infty)$.

(ii) If $A_{s,t} : G_{0,s} \oplus G_{s,s+t} \mapsto G_{0,s+t}$, is the map $A_{s,t}(x \oplus y) = x + y$, for $x \in G_{0,s}, y \in G_{s,s+t}$, then $A_{s,t} \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,s} \oplus G_{s,s+t}, G_{0,s+t})$, $\forall\ s, t \in (0, \infty)$.

(iii) The semigroup $\{S_t\}$ is strongly continuous.

We say that two sum systems $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t\})$ and $(\{G'_{a,b}\}, \{S'_t\})$ are isomorphic if there exists a family of operator $U_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}, G'_{0,t})$ preserving every structure of the sum systems, (i.e) $\{U_t\}$ satisfies

$$A'_{s,t}(U_s \oplus S'_s|_{G'_{0,t}} U_t) = U_{s+t} A_{s,t}(1_{G_{0,s}} \oplus S_s|_{G_{0,t}}),$$

where $A'_{s,t}$ is defined for $(\{G'_{a,b}\}, \{S'_t\})$ similar to $A_{s,t}$ above.

The above definition is slightly stronger than the one given in [6]. Namely, we require here that $\{S_t\}$ is a C_0-semigroup acting on the global Hilbert space $G_{0,\infty}$ and axiom (ii) holds for $t = \infty$ also, though they were not assumed in [6].

Given a sum system $(\{G_{s,t}\},\{S_t\})$, we define Hilbert spaces $H_t = \Gamma(G_{0,t}^{\mathbb{C}})$, and unitary operators $U_{s,t} : H_s \otimes H_t \mapsto H_{s+t}$, by $U_{s,t} = \Gamma(A_{s,t})(1_{H_s} \otimes \Gamma(S_s|_{G_{0,t}}))$. It is proved in [6] that $(\{H_t\},\{U_{s,t}\})$ forms a product system. Isomorphic sum systems give rise to isomorphic product systems.

Let K be a complex Hilbert space and let $\{S_t\}$ be the shift semigroup of $L^2((0,\infty),K)$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}(S_tf)(s) &= 0, \quad s < t,\\ &= f(s-t), \quad s \geq t,\end{aligned}$$

for $f \in L^2((0,\infty),K)$. The CCR flow of index $\dim K$ is the E_0-semigroup α acting on $\mathbb{B}(\Gamma(L^2((0,\infty),K)))$ defined by $\alpha_t(W(f)) = W(S_tf)$.

To generalize the CCR flows, we ask the following question. Let G be a real Hilbert space and $H = \Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}})$. Suppose we have two semigroups of linear operators, $S_t,\ T_t : G \mapsto G$ for $t \geq 0$. Consider the association

$$\alpha_t(W(x)) \mapsto W(S_tx),\ \alpha_t(W(iy)) \mapsto W(iT_ty),\ x, y \in G.$$

When can we extend this map to an E_0-semigroup on $\mathbb{B}(H)$? The continuity and the semigroup property of $\{\alpha_t\}$ will immediately imply that both $\{S_t\}$ and $\{T_t\}$ have to be C_0-semigroups. Also, α_t being an endomorphism satisfies

$$\alpha_t(W(u)W(v)) = \alpha_t(W(u))\alpha_t(W(v)), u, v \in G^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

Comparing both sides, using the canonical commutation relation, we get

$$\langle S_tx, T_ty\rangle = \langle x, y\rangle \ \forall\ x, y \in G$$

which is same as saying $T_t^*S_t = 1$. Assume that these conditions are satisfied. Then for α_t to extend as an endomorphism of $\mathbb{B}(H)$, it is necessary and sufficient that α_t, as a representation of the Weyl algebra, is quasi-equivalent to the defining (vacuum) representation.

The following lemma, probably well-known among specialists, gives a complete answer to the above question. For convenience of the reader, we include a proof here.

Lemma 2.3. *Let G be a real Hilbert space and let S and T be operators in $\mathbb{B}(G)$ satisfying $T^*S = 1$. Then the representation π of the Weyl algebra for $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ given by*

$$\pi(W(x+iy)) = W(Sx+iTy), \quad x, y \in G$$

is quasi-equivalent to the defining representation if and only if $S - T$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt class operator.

Proof. Thanks to the relation $T^*S = 1$, the above π actually gives a representation of the Weyl algebra. Since T^* (resp. S^*) is a left inverse of S (resp. T), the range of S (resp. T) is closed and $|S|$ (resp. $|T|$) is invertible.

We first claim that π is a factor representation. Let $K_1 = \operatorname{Ran}(S)$ and $K_2 = \operatorname{Ran}(T)$, which are closed subspaces of G. Then the relation $T^*S = 1$ implies that we have $K_1 \cap K_2^{\perp} = K_2 \cap K_1^{\perp} = \{0\}$, and so

$$M := \{\pi(W(z));\ z \in G^{\mathbb{C}}\}'' = \{W(x+iy);\ x \in K_1,\ y \in K_2\}''$$

is a factor thanks to [1, Theorem 1]. The claim implies that π is quasi-equivalent to the restriction of π to $\overline{M\Phi}$, which is unitarily equivalent to the GNS representation of the quasi-free state $\omega'(x) = \langle \pi(x)\Phi, \Phi\rangle$. Therefore to prove the statement, it suffices to show that the GNS representations of the vacuum state ω and the quasi-free state ω' are quasi-equivalent if and only if $S - T$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. For that we can apply well-known criteria in [3], [7]. Note that ω and ω' are given by

$$\omega(W(x+iy)) = e^{-(\|x\|^2+\|y\|^2)/2}, \quad , x, y \in G,$$

$$\omega'(W(x+iy)) = e^{-(\langle |S|^2x,x\rangle + \langle |T|^2 y, y\rangle)/2}, \quad x, y \in G.$$

Since we deal with Weyl operators rather than creation and annihilation operators, we use the criterion in [7], and we first recall the notation there. Let $\sigma(z_1, z_2) = -\mathrm{Im}\,\langle z_1, z_2\rangle$, which is a symplectic form of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ as a real vector space. Then we have the Weyl relation $W(z_1)W(z_2) = e^{-i\sigma(z_1,z_2)}W(z_1 + z_2)$. Let $A(x + iy) = y - ix$ and $B(x + iy) = |T|^2y - i|S|^2x$ and let $s_A(z_1, z_2) = \sigma(Az_1, z_2)$, $s_B(z_1, z_2) = \sigma(Bz_1, z_2)$. Then the two states are given by $\omega(W(z)) = e^{-s_A(z,z)/2}$ and $\omega'(W(z)) = e^{-s_B(z,z)/2}$. To see that ω' is a quasi-free state, we have to verify that $B^*B - 1$ is positive as an operator acting on the real Hilbert space $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ equipped with the inner product s_B. Since $B^* = -B$, all we have to show is $|S|^2|T|^2|S|^2 \geq |S|^2$ and $|T^2||S|^2|T^2| \geq |T|^2$, or equivalently just $|S||T|^2|S| \geq 1$. Indeed, let $S = U|S|$ and $T = V|T|$ be the polar decomposition of S and T respectively. Then thanks to $T^*S = 1$, we have $V^*U = |T|^{-1}|S|^{-1}$, and so we get $1 \geq V^*UU^*V = |T|^{-1}|S|^{-2}|T|^{-1}$, which shows $|S||T|^2|S| \geq 1$.

Let $Q_A = A + A\sqrt{1 + A^{-2}} = A$ and $Q_B = B + B\sqrt{1 + B^{-2}}$, where $\sqrt{1 + B^{-2}}$ is a positive operator acting on $(G^{\mathbb{C}}, s_B)$ satisfying $\sqrt{1 + B^{-2}}^2 = 1 + B^{-2}$. Then the two GNS representations are quasi-equivalent if and only if $Q_A^{-1}Q_B - 1$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator [7, page 190]. In the rest of the proof, the symbol $\equiv$ means equality up to a Hilbert-Schmidt class operator. Straightforward computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} Q_A^{-1}Q_B(x+iy) &= |S|(1 + \sqrt{1 - |S|^{-1}|T|^{-2}|S|^{-1}})|S|x \\ &+ i|T|(1 + \sqrt{1 - |T|^{-1}|S|^{-2}|T|^{-1}})|T|y, \end{aligned}$$

and so $Q_A^{-1}Q_B - 1$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator if and only if the following two relations hold:

$$\sqrt{1 - |S|^{-1}|T|^{-2}|S|^{-1}} \equiv |S|^{-2} - 1, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\sqrt{1 - |T|^{-1}|S|^{-2}|T|^{-1}} \equiv |T|^{-2} - 1. \tag{2.6}$$

Assume first that the equations (2.5) and (2.6) hold. Then (2.5) implies

$$1 - |S|^{-1}|T|^{-2}|S|^{-1} \equiv 1 - 2|S|^{-2} + |S|^{-4},$$

which is equivalent to $|S|^{-2} + |T|^{-2} \equiv 2$. Therefore (2.5), (2.6), and this imply

$$\sqrt{1 - |S|^{-1}|T|^{-2}|S|^{-1}} + \sqrt{1 - |T|^{-1}|S|^{-2}|T|^{-1}} \equiv 0.$$

Since the left-hand side is a positive operator, each term must be a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. This means that the both sides of (2.5) and (2.6) are Hilbert-Schmidt operators. In particular, we have $|S|^{-2} \equiv |T|^{-2} \equiv 1$ and the two operators $1 - |S|^{-1}|T|^{-2}|S|^{-1}$ and $1 - |T|^{-1}|S|^{-2}|T|^{-1}$ are trace class operators. Since this shows that $|S|^2 - |T|^{-2}$ is a trace class operator, the operator

$$(S-T)^*(S-T) = |S^2| + |T|^2 - 2 = |S|^2 - |T|^{-2} + (|T|^{-2} - 1)^2|T|^2$$

is a trace class operator. This shows that $S - T$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Assume conversely that $S - T$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator now. Then $0 \equiv S^*(S-T) = |S|^2 - 1$, $0 \equiv T^*(T-S) = |T|^2 - 1$ and

$$(S-T)^*(S-T) = |S|^2 + |T|^2 - 2$$

is a trace class operator. Therefore a similar computation as above shows that (2.5) and (2.6) hold. □

The above lemma allows us to introduce the notion of a generalized CCR flow.

Definition 2.4. Let $\{S_t\}$ and $\{T_t\}$ be C_0-semigroups acting on a real Hilbert space G. We say that $\{T_t\}$ is a perturbation of $\{S_t\}$, if they satisfy,

(i) ${T_t}^*S_t = 1$.
(ii) $S_t - T_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator.

Given a perturbation $\{T_t\}$ of $\{S_t\}$, we say that the E_0-semigroup $\{\alpha_t\}$ acting on $\mathbb{B}(\Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}}))$ given by

$$\alpha_t(W(x+iy)) = W(S_tx + iT_ty), \quad x, y \in G$$

is a generalized CCR flow associated with the pair $\{S_t\}$ and $\{T_t\}$.

In fact we can also show from Proposition 3.6 (see Section 3) that a pair of $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ gives rise to a generalized CCR flow if T_t is a perturbation of S_t.

From Section 5 onwards we will follow the notations used in [10]. We will denote by $\{S_t\}$ the shift semigroup of $L^2(0,\infty)$. For $f, g \in L^2(0,\infty)$, we denote

$$(f,g) = \int_0^\infty f(x)g(x)dx,$$

while $\langle f, g\rangle$ denotes the usual complex inner product. Let $\mathbb{H}_r$ be the right-half plane $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} x > 0\}$. For $z \in \mathbb{H}_r$ we set $e_z(x) = e^{-zx}$. We denote by $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ the set of all measurable functions on $[0,\infty)$ which are integrable on every compact subsets of $[0,\infty)$. For $f \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ and $a > 1$, such that the function $e^{-ax}f(x) \in L^1(0,\infty)$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}[f](z)$ the Laplace transform

$$\mathcal{L}[f](z) = \int_0^\infty f(x)e^{-zx}dx, \ \operatorname{Re} z > a.$$

Let $\mathcal{HD}$ be the set of holomorphic functions $M(z)$ on the right-half plane $\mathbb{H}_r$ such that $M(z)/(1+z)$ belongs to the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$ and $M(z)$ does not belong to $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. Then we can associate a differential operator A_M through the procedure described in [10, Sections 2 and 3]. Namely, let $q \in L^2(0,\infty)$ such that

$\mathcal{L}[q](z) = M(z)/(1+z)$. Then A_M is the differential operator $A_M f(x) = -f'(x)$ whose domain $D(A_M)$ is the set of locally absolutely continuous functions $f \in L^2(0,\infty)$ such that $f' \in L^2(0,\infty)$ and $(f - f', q) = 0$.

We denote by $\mathcal{HD}_b$ the set of $M \in \mathcal{HD}$ such that A_M generates a C_0-semigroup, and by $\mathcal{HD}_2$ the set of $M \in \mathcal{HD}_b$ such that $e^{tA_M} - S_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $t \geq 0$, where $\{S_t\}$ is the shift semigroup. The semigroup $\{T_t = e^{tA_M}\}$ will satisfy the relation $T_t^* S_t = 1$ for all $t \geq 0$. Conversely for any given C_0-semigroup T_t satisfying $T_t^* S_t = 1$, its generator A can be described by a $M(z) \in \mathcal{HD}_b$ as above and $M(z)$ is unique up to a non-zero scalar multiple.

On the other hand suppose $\{T_t = S_t + K_t\}$ be a C_0-semigroup on $L^2(0,\infty)$ such that $\{T_t\}$ is a perturbation of the shift semigroup $\{S_t\}$. Then it is proved in [10, Section 4] that there exists a measurable function $k(x,y)$ defined on $(0,\infty)^2$ and $a > 0$, satisfying

$$k(x+t,y) = k(x,y+t) + \int_0^t k(x,s)k(t-s,y)ds, \ \forall\, t \geq 0, \ \text{a.e}\ (x,y) \in (0,\infty)^2 \tag{2.7}$$

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |e^{-ax}k(x,y)|^2 dxdy < \infty \tag{2.8}$$

such that

$$K_t f(x) = 1_{(0,t)}(x) \int_0^t k(t-x,y)f(y)dy, \quad f \in L^2(0,\infty).$$

Conversely if K_t is given by a measurable function $k(x,y)$ as above, satisfying (2.7) and (2.8), then the C_0-semigroup $\{T_t = S_t + K_t\}$ satisfies the above conditions (i) and (ii).

As described in [10, Section 6], Tsirelson's type III E_0-semigroups arising from off white noises (see [18], [19]) are isomorphic to generalized CCR flows associated with $\{S_t\}$ and $\{T_t\}$ as above with the spectral density functions $|M(iy)|^2$.

Now we describe a particular subclass of C_0-semigroups which are perturbations of the shift. We denote $x \wedge y = \min\{x,y\}$. It is proved in [10, Lemma 5.1] that for any $\varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1dx)$, there exists a unique ψ and a positive real number a satisfying $e_a\psi \in L^1(0,\infty)$ and

$$\mathcal{L}[\psi] = \frac{\mathcal{L}[\varphi]}{1 - \mathcal{L}[\varphi]}.$$

The following theorem is also proved in [10, Theorem 5.2].

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1dx)$ and ψ be defined as above. Then $k(x,y)$ defined by*

$$k(x,y) = \varphi(x+y) + \int_0^x \varphi(x+y-s)\psi(s)ds,$$

satisfies the conditions (2.7), (2.8), and consequently gives rise to a C_0-semigroup $\{T_t\}$ satisfying conditions (i) *and* (ii) *of Definition 2.4.*

We will often be using the following theorem [10, Theorem 5.3].

Theorem 2.6. *Let* $\varphi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1 dx)$ *and* $\{T_t\}$ *be the* C_0*-semigroup constructed from* φ *as in the above theorem, which is a perturbation of the shift. Let* A_M*, with* $M \in \mathcal{HD}_2$*, be the generator of* $\{T_t\}$ *and let* $q \in L^2(0,\infty) \setminus D(A)$ *be the function satisfying* $(1+z)\mathcal{L}[q](z) = M(z)$*. Then* q *is continuous at* 0 *and* $M(z) = q(0)(1 - \mathcal{L}[\varphi](z))$*.*

When φ is a real function in $L^1_{\text{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1 dx)$ and let $M = 1 - \mathcal{L}[\varphi]$, then we get a C_0-semigroup $\{T_t\}$ as described above, which preserves the real functions in $L^2(0,\infty)$. We will show in Section 7 that the generalized CCR flows α^φ associated with such pairs $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ is type III if and only if $\varphi \notin L^2(0,\infty)$.

In the last section we associate von Neumann algebras to bounded open sets in $(0,\infty)$, for each E_0-semigroup in this family. These local von Neumann algebras form an invariant for the E_0-semigroup. For a subfamily of the above constructed E_0-semigroups, we provide two different open sets for given two different E_0-semigroups, whose associated von Neumann algebra is a type III factor for the first E_0-semigroup and type I factor for the second E_0-semigroup. This way we show that there exists an uncountable family of type III E_0-semigroups which are mutually non-cocycle conjugate.

3. Sum systems and Generalized CCR flows

In this section we study the E_0-semigroup associated with the product system constructed out of a given sum system. Fix a sum system $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t\})$ and let $(\{H_t\}, \{U_{s,t}\})$ be the product system constructed out of it. Denote $G = G_{0,\infty}$, $A_t = A_{t,\infty}$. For $x \in G$, define $x_s \in G_{0,s}$, $x_{s,t} \in G_{s,t}$, and $x_{t,\infty} \in G_{t,\infty}$ by the unique decomposition,

$$x = x_s + x_{s,t} + x_{t,\infty}.$$

We may consider S_t as a bounded linear invertible map from G onto $G_{t,\infty}$. Hence $(S_t^*)^{-1}$ is a well-defined bounded operator from G onto $G_{t,\infty}$. When there is no confusion, by misusing the notation, we consider $(S_t^*)^{-1}$ as an element of $\mathbb{B}(G)$ itself. Define $T_t \in \mathbb{B}(G)$, by

$$T_t = (A_t^*)^{-1} A_t^{-1} (S_t^*)^{-1} \ \forall\, t \in [0,\infty).$$

Lemma 3.1. *For any* $y \in G_{0,\infty}$*, the family* $\{S_t^{-1} y_{t,\infty}\}_{t>0}$ *converges to* y*, as* $t \to 0$*.*

Proof. We have

$$\|S_t^{-1} y_{t,\infty} - y\| = \|S_t^{-1}(y_{t,\infty} - S_t y)\| \leq \|S_t^{-1}\|(\|y_{t,\infty} - y\| + \|S_t y - y\|).$$

We claim that there exist positive numbers c and ε such that for all $x \in G$ and $t \in (0,\varepsilon)$ we have $||S_t x|| \geq c\|x\|$. Indeed, if it were not the case, we would have a decreasing sequence $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of positive numbers converging to zero and a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in G satisfying $\|x_n\| = 1$ such that $\{\|S_{t_n} x_n\|\}_{n=1}^\infty$ converges to zero. Note that since $\{S_t\}$ is a C_0-semigroup, there exist positive constants a and b such that $\|S_t\| \leq ae^{bt}$ holds for all $t > 0$ (see [20, page 232]). We choose $s > t_1$. Then

$$\|S_s x_n\| = \|S_{s-t_n} S_{t_n} x_n\| \leq \|S_{s-t_n}\| \|S_{t_n} x_n\| \leq ae^{bs} \|S_{t_n} x_n\| \to 0, \ (n \to \infty),$$

which is a contradiction because S_s is invertible as a map from G onto $G_{s,\infty}$. Therefore the claim is proved, and so $\|S_t^{-1}\|$ is bounded when t tends to 0. On the other hand $S_t y$ converges to y by the strong continuity of the semigroup $\{S_t\}$ and $y_{t,\infty}$ converges to y (see [6, Proposition 24]), which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 3.2. *$\{T_t\}$ forms a C_0-semigroup on G.*

Proof. Note that $T_t x = (A_t^*)^{-1}(0 \oplus (S_t^*)^{-1} x)$, and therefore

$$\langle T_t x, y \rangle = \langle (0 \oplus (S_t^*)^{-1} x), A_t^{-1} y \rangle = \langle x, S_t^{-1} y_{t,\infty} \rangle, \quad \forall \quad x, y \in G. \tag{3.1}$$

Hence for any $x, y \in G$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_s T_t x, y \rangle &= \langle T_t x, S_s^{-1}(y_{s,\infty}) \rangle \\ &= \langle (S_t^*)^{-1} x, (S_s^{-1} y_{s,\infty})_{t,\infty} \rangle \\ &= \langle (S_{s+t}^*)^{-1} x, S_s (S_s^{-1} y_{s,\infty})_{t,\infty} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $y_{s,\infty} = S_s y'$ for some $y' \in G$, then $S_s(S_s^{-1} y_{s,\infty})_{t,\infty} = S_s y'_{t,\infty} = y_{s+t,\infty}$. Hence we get

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_s T_t x, y \rangle &= \langle (S_{s+t}^*)^{-1} x, y_{s+t,\infty} \rangle \\ &= \langle T_{s+t} x, y \rangle \end{aligned}$$

So $\{T_t\}$ forms a semigroup. Now equation (3.1), thanks to Lemma 3.1, will imply that the semigroup $\{T_t\}$ is weak and hence strongly continuous (see [20, page 233]). So $\{T_t\}$ forms a C_0-semigroup. □

We say that the pair $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ is associated with the sum system $(G_{a,b}, S_t)$.

The E_0-semigroup associated with the product system $(H_t, U_{s,t})$ can be described in terms of these two semigroups, $\{S_t\}$ and $\{T_t\}$ as follows. Let $H = \Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}})$.

Proposition 3.3. *Let the notation be as above. Then there is a unique E_0-semigroup α_t on $\mathbb{B}(H)$ satisfying*

$$\alpha_t(W(x)) = W(S_t x), \ \alpha_t(W(iy)) = W(iT_t y), \ x, y \in G.$$

Moreover the product system associated with this E_0-semigroup is the one constructed out of the sum system.

Proof. Fix $t \geq 0$. Set $H_{t,\infty} = \Gamma(G_{t,\infty}^{\mathbb{C}})$ and $U_t = \Gamma(A_t) : H_t \otimes H_{t,\infty} \to H$.

The map $T \mapsto \Gamma(S_t) T \Gamma(S_t)^*$ is an isomorphism between $\mathbb{B}(H)$ and $B(H_{t,\infty})$. So we get a $*$-endomorphism α_t^0 of $\mathbb{B}(H)$ defined by

$$T \quad \mapsto \quad U_t(1_{H_{0,t}} \otimes \Gamma(S_t) T \Gamma(S_t)^*) U_t^* \tag{3.2}$$

We claim that the above endomorphism is α_t. Indeed, for $x, y \in G$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t^0(W(x+iy)) &= \Gamma(A_t)W(0 \oplus (S_t x + iS_t^{-1*}y))\Gamma(A_t)^* \\ &= W(S_t x + iA_t^{-1*}(0 \oplus S_t^{-1*}y)) \\ &= W(S_t x + iT_t y), \end{aligned}$$

where we identify $1_{H_t} \otimes W(z)$ with $W(0 \oplus z)$ for $z \in G^{\mathbb{C}}_{t,\infty}$. Hence α_t defined in the proposition extends to a $*$-endomorphism on $\mathbb{B}(H)$, and we get a generalized CCR flow. Since any endomorphism on $\mathbb{B}(H)$ is determined uniquely by its restriction to the Weyl algebra, α_t is the unique extension.

To determine the product system of this E_0-semigroup, we want to determine the family of Hilbert spaces

$$E_t = \{T \in \mathbb{B}(H) : \alpha_t(X)T = TX \ \forall \ X \in \mathbb{B}(H)\}.$$

Given a $\xi_t \in H_t$, we define a bounded operator T_{ξ_t} on H by the following prescription,

$$T_{\xi_t}\xi = U_t(\xi_t \otimes \Gamma(S_t)\xi), \ \forall \ \xi \in H.$$

It is easy to verify that T_{ξ_t} defines a bounded operator, and that

$$\langle T^*_{\xi'_t} T_{\xi_t}\xi, \eta\rangle = \langle \xi_t, \xi'_t\rangle_{H_t} 1_H, \ \forall \ \xi_t, \xi'_t \in H_t.$$

We claim that $T_{\xi_t} \in E_t$. In fact by the definition of α_t (see equation (3.2))

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_t(X)T_{\xi_t}\xi &= U_t(1_{H_{0,t}} \otimes \Gamma(S_t)X\Gamma(S_t)^*)U_t^* U_t(\xi_t \otimes \Gamma(S_t)\xi) \\ &= U_t(\xi_t \otimes \Gamma(S_t)X\xi) \\ &= T_{\xi_t}X\xi \end{aligned}$$

So the association $\xi_t \mapsto T_{\xi_t}$ provides an isometry between H_t into E_t. We only need to prove that this map is surjective. Suppose $T \in E_t$ be such that $T^*T_{\xi_t} = 0 \ \forall \ \xi_t \in H_t$, that is T^* vanishes on all vectors of the form $U_t(\xi_t \otimes \Gamma(S_t)\xi), \ \xi_t \in H_t, \xi \in H$. But such vectors forms a total subset of H, and hence we conclude that $T = 0$. It is also easy to verify that the product structure is also preserved. □

The above proposition together with Lemma 2.3 imply

Corollary 3.4. *Let the notation be as above. Then $\{T_t\}$ is a perturbation of $\{S_t\}$.*

Now we investigate the reverse question. Let G be a real Hilbert space and $H = \Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}})$. We assume that a C_0-semigroup $\{T_t\}$ is a perturbation of another C_0-semigroup $\{S_t\}$ acting on G. Our task is to determine the product system for the generalized CCR flow associated with the pair $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$.

Define

$$G_{0,t} = \mathrm{Ker}\,(T_t^*), \ G_{(0,\infty)} = \overline{\bigcup_{t>0} G_{0,t}}, \ G_{a,b} = S_a(G_{0,b-a}).$$

We verify that $G_{a,b} \subseteq G_{c,d}$ whenever $(a,b) \subseteq (c,d)$. This is same as saying

$$S_c S_{a-c}(G_{0,b-a}) \subseteq S_c(G_{0,d-c}).$$

So we only need to verify that $S_{a-c}x \in G_{0,d-c}$, for any $x \in G_{0,b-a}$.

First we assume that $d \neq \infty$. We verify that $S_{a-c}x \perp \operatorname{Ran}(T_{d-c})$ as follows. For $z \in G$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S_{a-c}x, T_{d-c}z\rangle &= \langle x, S_{a-c}^* T_{a-c} T_{d-a} z\rangle \\ &= \langle x, T_{d-a}z\rangle \\ &= \langle x, T_{b-a}T_{d-b}z\rangle \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Now let $d = \infty$. If $b \neq \infty$ then the above verification itself implies that, for any finite $d' \geq b$, we have

$$S_c S_{a-c}(G_{0,b-a}) \subseteq S_c(G_{0,d'-c}) \subseteq S_c(G_{0,\infty}).$$

So we have to consider only the case when $b = \infty$, and equivalently we only have to show that $S_t(G_{0,\infty}) \subseteq G_{0,\infty}$ for any $t \geq 0$. But this follows immediately as we have already shown that for any fixed $s \geq 0$, $S_s(G_{0,t}) \subset G_{0,\infty}$ for all $s, t \geq 0$.

Note that since S_t has a left inverse T_t^*, the range of S_t is closed and the operator S_t from G onto $\operatorname{Ran}(S_t)$ has a bounded inverse.

Lemma 3.5. *Let the notation be as above and* $0 < t < s \leq \infty$. *Then*

(i) *We have* $T_t^* G_{0,s} \subset G_{0,s-t}$.

(ii) *The two operators* $S_t T_t^*$ *and* $1 - S_t T_t^*$ *are idempotents such that* $\operatorname{Ran}(S_t T_t^*) = \operatorname{Ker}(1 - S_t T_t^*) = \operatorname{Ran}(S_t)$ *and* $\operatorname{Ran}(1 - S_t T_t^*) = \operatorname{Ker}(S_t T_t^*) = G_{0,t}$. *In particular, the Hilbert space* G *is a topological direct sum of* $G_{0,t}$ *and* $\operatorname{Ran}(S_t)$.

(iii) *The Hilbert space* $G_{0,s}$ *is a topological direct sum of* $G_{0,t}$ *and* $S_t G_{0,s-t}$.

Proof. (i) It is easy to verify the statement for finite s. Assume $x \in G_{0,\infty}$. Then there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ converging to x such that $x_n \in G_{0,n}$. Thus for n larger than t, we get $T_t^* x_n \in G_{0,n-t}$. Since $\{T_t^* x_n\}$ converges to $T_t^* x$, the statement holds.

(ii) follows from direct computation. (iii) follows from (i) and (ii). $\square$

Let $P : G \to G_{0,\infty}$ be the orthogonal projection. We define S_t^0 and T_t^0 by

$$S_t^0 = P S_t P, \ T_t^0 = P T_t P.$$

Then $\{S_t^0\}$ and $\{T_t^0\}$ are C_0-semigroups and one is a perturbation of the other. Indeed, it follows from the fact that the inclusion relation $S_t(G_{0,\infty}) \subseteq G_{0,\infty}$ implies $(1-P)S_t P = 0$ and Lemma 3.5,(i) implies $P T_t (1-P) = 0$ for all $t > 0$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let* G *be a real Hilbert space and let* $\{S_t\}$ *and* $\{T_t\}$ *be* C_0*-semigroups acting on* G *such that* $\{T_t\}$ *is a perturbation of* $\{S_t\}$. *Let* $\{G_{s,t}\}$, $\{S_t^0\}$, *and* $\{T_t^0\}$ *be as above. Then*

(a) *The system* $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t^0\})$ *forms a sum system.*

(b) *The pair of* C_0*-semigroups* $(\{S_t^0\}, \{T_t^0\})$ *is associated with* $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t^0\})$. *In consequence, the product system for the generalized CCR flow arising from* $(\{S_t^0\}, \{T_t^0\})$ *is isomorphic to the one arising from* $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t^0\})$.

(c) *The product system for the generalized CCR flow arising from* $(\{S_t\},\{T_t\})$ *is isomorphic to the product system arising from* $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t^0\})$. *In consequence, the generalized CCR flow arising from the pair* $(\{S_t\},\{T_t\})$ *is cocycle conjugate to that arising from* $(\{S_t^0\},\{T_t^0\})$.

Proof. (a) We have already shown the axiom (iii) of Definition 2.2 and $G_{a,b}\subseteq G_{c,d}$ for $(a,b)\subseteq(c,d)$. Since $\{T_t^0\}$ is a perturbation of $\{S_t^0\}$, the operator S_t^0 has a left inverse $T_t^{0^*}$. Therefore the restriction of S_t^0 to $G_{0,s}$ is an invertible operator from $G_{0,s}$ onto $S_tG_{0,s}$ with the bounded inverse. Since $S_t^{0*}(T_t^0-S_t^0)=P-S_t^{0*}S_t^0$ is a Hilbert Schmidt operator, the axiom (i) is satisfied.

To prove the axiom (ii), it is enough if we prove that the operator

$$A_{t,\infty}:G_{0,t}\oplus G_{t,\infty}\ni x\oplus y\mapsto x+y\in G_{0,\infty},$$

is in the class $\mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}\oplus G_{t,\infty},G_{0,\infty})$, for all $t\in(0,\infty)$. Let $G'_t=\mathrm{Ran}\,(S_t)$. We will prove a stronger statement that the operator,

$$A'_t:G_{0,t}\oplus G'_t\ni x\oplus y\mapsto x+y\in G,$$

is in the class $\mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}\oplus G'_t,G)$, for all $t\in(0,\infty)$. Thanks to Lemma 3.5, the operator A'_t has a bounded inverse. Let $x_1,x_2\in G_{0,t}$ and $y_1,y_2\in G_{0,\infty}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle {A'_t}^*A'_t(x_1\oplus S_ty_1),x_2\oplus S_ty_2\rangle=\langle x_1+S_ty_1,x_2+S_ty_2\rangle\\
&\quad=\ \langle x_1,x_2\rangle+\langle S_ty_1,S_ty_2\rangle+\langle x_1,S_ty_2\rangle+\langle S_ty_1,x_2\rangle\\
&\quad=\ \langle x_1\oplus S_ty_1,x_2\oplus S_ty_2\rangle+\langle T_t(S_t^*-T_t^*)x_1,S_ty_2\rangle+\langle S_ty_1,T_t(S_t^*-T_t^*)x_2\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use $T_t^*x_1=T_t^*x_2=0$. This shows that $A'_t\in\mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}\oplus G'_t,G)$ and in consequence $A_{s,t}\in\mathcal{S}(G_{0,s}\oplus G_{s,s+t},G_{0,s+t})$. Therefore the axiom (ii) holds and $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ is a sum system.

(b) It suffices to verify

$$T_t^0=(A_{t,\infty}^*)^{-1}(A_{t,\infty}^{-1})(S_t^{0*})^{-1},$$

where S_t^0 is regarded as an element of $\mathbb{B}(G_{0,\infty},G_{t,\infty})$. For $y\in G$, let $y=y_t+y_{t,\infty}$ be the unique decomposition such that $y_t\in G_{0,t},y_{t,\infty}\in G_{t,\infty}$. By a calculation we have already done in Lemma 3.2, for $x,y\in G$, we have,

$$\langle(A_{t,\infty}^*)^{-1}(A_{t,\infty}^{-1})(S_t^*)^{-1}x,y\rangle=\langle x,S_t^{-1}y_{t,\infty}\rangle.$$

On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle T_t^0x,y\rangle\ &=\ \langle x,T_t{}^*(y_t+S_tS_t^{-1}y_{t,\infty})\rangle\\
&=\ \langle x,S_t^{-1}y_{t,\infty}\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(\{S_t^0\},\{T_t^0\})$ is associated with $(\{G_{s,t}\},\{S_t^0\})$.

(c) We use the notation of the proof of (a). Proceeding exactly in the same way as in the proof of (b), by replacing $G_{t,\infty}$ with G'_t, we can verify that

$$T_t=({A'_t}^*)^{-1}{A'_t}^{-1}(S_t^*)^{-1},$$

with $(S_t^*)^{-1}$ regarded as an element in $\mathcal{S}(G, G'_t)$. By replacing $\Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}}_{t,\infty})$ with $\Gamma({G'_t}^{\mathbb{C}})$, and by exactly imitating the proof of the Proposition 3.3, we conclude that

$$R \mapsto \Gamma(A'_t)(1_{\Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}}_{0,t})} \otimes \Gamma(S_t)R\Gamma(S_t)^*)\Gamma(A'_t)^*,$$

is the generalized CCR flow given by the pair $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$.

If we again imitate the proof of Proposition 3.3, the part where the product system is computed, we will be able to see that the product system associated with the generalized CCR flow given by the pair $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ also coincides with the product system constructed out of the sum system $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t\})$.

Since the product systems determine E_0-semigroups up to cocycle conjugacy, we conclude that the generalized CCR flow given by $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ is cocycle conjugate to the generalized CCR flow given by $(\{S^0_t\}, \{T^0_t\})$. □

Remark 3.7. It is practically impossible to classify pairs $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ of C_0-semigroups acting on G as above without posing any condition and let us consider the case where $\{S_t\}$ is a semigroup of isometries. Then up to unitary equivalence we may assume that $G = L^2((0,\infty), K) \oplus L$ and $S_t = S'_t \oplus U_t$, where $\{S'_t\}$ is the shift semigroup and $\{U_t\}$ is a 1-parameter unitary group. In this case, we have

$$T_t = \begin{pmatrix} T'_t & B_t \\ 0 & U_t \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\{T'_t\}$ is a perturbation of $\{S'_t\}$. It is routine work to show that the two sum systems for $(\{S_t\}, \{T_t\})$ and $(\{S'_t\}, \{T'_t\})$ are isomorphic (though not identical in general), and so Proposition 3.6 implies that the two generalized CCR flows arising from them are cocycle conjugate. Therefore it is worth investigating perturbations of the shift semigroup. This has been already done in [10] in the case where $\dim K = 1$ and we will analyze the structure of the resulting generalized CCR flows in Section 5-7.

4. Type III criterion

In this section we derive a necessary and sufficient condition, which would determine the type of the product system (in other words the type of the associated E_0-semigroup), arising from a divisible sum system with finite index. To begin with we define the notion of divisibility for sum systems and recall some results from [6]. We first define addits for a sum system, which were called as additive units in [6]

Definition 4.1. Let $(\{G_{a,b}\}, \{S_t\})$ be a sum system. A real addit for the sum system $(\{G_{(a,b)}\}, \{S_t\})$ is a family $\{x_t\}_{t\in(0,\infty)}$ such that $x_t \in G_{0,t}$, $\forall\, t \in (0,\infty)$, satisfying the following conditions.

(i) The map $t \mapsto \langle x_t, x\rangle$ is measurable for any $x \in G_{0,\infty}$.

(ii) $x_s + S_s x_t = x_{s+t}$, $\forall s, t, \in (0,\infty)$, (i. e.) $A_{s,t}(x_s \oplus S_s x_t) = x_{s+t}$.

An imaginary addit for the sum system $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ is a family $\{y_t\}_{t\in(0,\infty)}$ such that $y_t \in G_{0,t},\ \forall\, t\in(0,\infty)$, satisfying the following conditions.

(i) The map $t \mapsto \langle y_t, y\rangle$ is measurable for any $y\in G_{0,\infty}$.

(ii) $\{y_t\}$ satisfies $(A^*_{s,t})^{-1}(y_s \oplus (S^*_s)^{-1}y_t) = y_{s+t},\ \forall s,t,\in(0,\infty)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{RAU}$ and $\mathcal{IAU}$ the set of all real and imaginary addits respectively, which are real linear spaces. For a given real addit $\{x_t\}$, define $x_{s,t} = S_s(x_{t-s}) \in G_{s,t}$. Similarly for a given imaginary addit $\{y_t\}$ define $y_{s,t} = (S^*_s)^{-1}(y_{t-s}) \in G_{s,t}$.

We also define for an imaginary addit $\{y_t\}$,

$$G_{0,s} \ni {}^s y'_{s_1,s_2} = (A^*)^{-1}(0\oplus y_{s_1,s_2}\oplus 0),\ \text{for any } (s_1,s_2)\subset(0,s),$$

where $A : G_{0,s_1}\oplus G_{s_1,s_2}\oplus G_{s_2,s} \to G_{0,s}$ is defined by $x\oplus y\oplus z\mapsto x+y+z$. It is easy to check that ${}^s y'_{s_1,s_2} \in (G_{0,s_1}\bigvee G_{s_2,s})^{\perp}\cap G_{0,s}$. When $s=1$, we just denote ${}^t y'_{s_1,s_2}$by y'_{s_1,s_2}, and $y'_{0,t}$ by just y'_t. Finally note that

$$x_s + x_{s,s+t} = x_{s+t},\ y'_s + y'_{s,s+t} = y'_{s+t}.$$

Definition 4.2. A sum system $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ is called as a divisible sum system if the addits exist and generate the sum system, (i. e.)

$$G_{0,s} = \overline{\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{R}}[x_{s_1,s_2}; (s_1,s_2)\subseteq(0,s), \{x_t\}\in\mathcal{RAU}]}$$

and

$$G_{0,s} = \overline{\operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{R}}[{}^s y'_{s_1,s_2}; (s_1,s_2)\subseteq(0,s), \{y_t\}\in\mathcal{IAU}]}.$$

The following Proposition has been already proved in [6], except that $\{S_t\}$ need not be a semigroup of isometries. But in the proof of [6, Proposition 37 (ii)], the verification of measurability of the function $t\to\langle x_t, y_t\rangle$ does not need this assumption, and also the relation $\langle x_{s+t}, y_{s+t}\rangle = \langle x_s, y_s\rangle + \langle x_t, y_t\rangle$, can also be verified without this assumption.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $(\{G_{(a,b)}\},\{S_t\})$ be a divisible sum system. If $\{x_t\}\in\mathcal{RAU}$ and $\{y_t\}\in\mathcal{IAU}$, then*

$$\langle x_t, y_t\rangle = \langle x_1, y_1\rangle t\ \forall\ t\in(0,\infty).$$

In general for any two intervals $(s_1,s_2),\ (t_1,t_2)\subset(0,s)$, it is true that

$$\langle x_{s_1,s_2}, {}^s y'_{t_1,t_2}\rangle = \langle x_1,y_1\rangle|(s_1,s_2)\cap(t_1,t_2)|, \tag{4.1}$$

where $|.|$ is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

The next lemma immediately follows from the definition of a divisible sum system and Proposition 4.3, which allows us to introduce the notion of the index of a divisible sum system.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ be a divisible sum system. For $x=\{x_t\}\in\mathcal{RAU}$ and $y=\{y_t\}\in IAU$, we set $b_G(x,y)=\langle x_1,y_1\rangle$. Then b_G is non-degenerate as a bilinear form $b_G : \mathcal{RAU}\times\mathcal{IAU}\to\mathbb{R}$.*

Definition 4.5. For a divisible sum system $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$, the index $\operatorname{ind} G$ is the number $\dim R\mathcal{AU} = \dim I\mathcal{AU} \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{\infty\}$.

From now onwards we assume that $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ is a divisible sum system. We further assume that $\operatorname{ind} G = n$ is finite. In that case, both $R\mathcal{AU}$ and $I\mathcal{AU}$ carry unique linear topologies. Denote

$$G^0_{0,t} = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{R}}[x_{s_1,s_2}; (s_1,s_2)\subseteq(0,t),\ \{x_t\}\in R\mathcal{AU}] \subseteq G_{0,t},$$

$${G^0_{0,t}}' = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{R}}[{}^t y'_{s_1,s_2}; (s_1,s_2)\subseteq(0,t),\ \{y_t\}\in I\mathcal{AU}] \subseteq G_{0,t}.$$

For a given linear map $J : R\mathcal{AU}\to I\mathcal{AU}$, we set $J_{t,0}$ to be the linear map $J_{t,0} : G^0_{0,t} \to {G^0_{0,t}}'$ determined by

$$J_{t,0}(x_{s_1,s_2}) = {}^tJ(x)'_{s_1,s_2},$$

for $(s_1,s_2)\subseteq(0,t)$ and $x\in R\mathcal{AU}$. When $J_{t,0}$ has a bounded extension to $G_{0,t}$ we denote it by J_t.

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a real Hilbert space and let R_0 be a real linear operator on $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ with dense domain $D(R_0)$, which preserves imaginary parts of the inner product. Suppose there exists a unitary operator $U\in\mathbb{B}(\Gamma(G^{\mathbb{C}}))$ satisfying*

$$UW(x)U^* \;=\; W(R_0x),\ \forall\, x\in D(R_0), \tag{4.2}$$

then R_0 extends to a bounded invertible operator R on $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. Further it is true that $R\in\mathcal{S}(G\oplus G, G\oplus G)$, where we identify $G\oplus G$ with $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ equipped with the real inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathbb{R}} = \operatorname{Re}\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$.

Proof. First let us prove that R_0 is bounded. Suppose $\{x_n\}\subseteq D(R_0)$ be any sequence which converges to 0. Then, by the strong continuity of the Weyl representation, we conclude that $W(x_n)$ converges strongly to 1. Therefore, by our assumption (4.2), it follows that $W(R_0x_n)$ also converges strongly to 1. Consequently $\langle W(R_0x_n)\Phi,\Phi\rangle = e^{-\|R_0x_n\|^2/2}$ converges to 1 and hence we conclude that R_0x_n also converges to 0.

We claim that the range of R_0 is dense in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. Let $K = \operatorname{Ran}(R_0)^{\perp}$ with respect to the real inner product. Then [1, Theorem 1,(5)] shows

$$\{W(R_0z);\ z\in G^{\mathbb{C}}\}' = \{W(z);\ z\in iK\}''.$$

Since the left-hand side is $\mathbb{C}$ thanks to $W(R_0z) = UW(z)U^*$, we get $K=\{0\}$, which shows the claim. Note that R_0 is automatically injective and the inverse of R_0 is well defined as a densely defined operator. A similar argument as above shows that the inverse is also bounded. The remaining part follows from the converse statement in the original Shales theorem ([13]). ☐

We will also be using the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.7. *Let G be a second countable locally compact abelian group and let (w, K) be a continuous unitary representation of G on a complex Hilbert space K without containing the trivial representation. Let $c : G \to K$ be a continuous 1-cocycle, that is, the map c satisfies the cocycle relation*

$$c(r+s) = c(r) + w(r)c(s), \quad \forall\ r, s \in G.$$

Then the following equation holds for all $r, s \in G$:

$$\langle c(r), w(r)c(s)\rangle = \langle c(s), w(s)c(r)\rangle.$$

Proof. Thanks to [17, Theorem 4.2.1], there exists a sequence $\{z_n\}$ in K such that $\{z_n - w(g)z_n\}$ uniformly converges to $c(g)$ on every compact subset of G. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle c(r), w(r)c(s)\rangle &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle z_n - w(r)z_n, w(r)z_n - w(r)w(s)z_n\rangle \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\big(\langle z_n, w(r)z_n\rangle + \langle z_n, w(s)z_n\rangle - \langle z_n, z_n\rangle - \langle z_n, w(r)w(s)z_n\rangle\big)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle c(s), w(s)c(r)\rangle &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\langle z_n - w(s)z_n, w(s)z_n - w(s)w(r)z_n\rangle \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\big(\langle z_n, w(s)z_n\rangle + \langle z_n, w(r)z_n\rangle - \langle z_n, z_n\rangle - \langle z_n, w(s)w(r)z_n\rangle\big),\end{aligned}$$

which shows the statement. □

Let K be a complex Hilbert space. Recall that the automorphism group G_K of the exponential product system of index $\dim K$ is described as follows (see [5]): Let $U(K)$ be the unitary group of K. Then G_K is homeomorphic to $\mathbb{R} \times K \times U(K)$ with the group operation

$$(a, \xi, u) \cdot (b, \eta, v) = (a + b + \operatorname{Im}\langle \xi, u\eta\rangle, \xi + u\eta, uv).$$

For $(a, \xi, u) \in G_K$, the corresponding automorphism is realized by the family of unitary operators $e^{iat}W(1_{(0,t]}\xi)\operatorname{Exp}(1_{(0,t]}u)$, $t > 0$. Direct computation shows the following:

Lemma 4.8. *Let G be an abelian group and let $\rho : G \ni r \mapsto (a(r), \xi(r), u(r)) \in G_K$ be a map. Then ρ is a homomorphism if and only if the following relation holds for every $r, s \in G$:*

$$a(r+s) = a(r) + a(s) + \operatorname{Im}\langle \xi(r), u(r)\xi(s)\rangle, \tag{4.3}$$

$$\xi(r+s) = \xi(r) + u(r)\xi(s), \tag{4.4}$$

$$u(r+s) = u(r)u(s). \tag{4.5}$$

In particular, when $u(r) = 1$ for all $r \in G$, then ρ is a homomorphism if and only if

$$a(r+s) = a(r) + a(s), \tag{4.6}$$

$$\xi(r+s) = \xi(r) + \xi(s), \tag{4.7}$$

$$\operatorname{Im}\langle\xi(r),\xi(s)\rangle = 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Proof. The first statement is obvious. Assume $u(r) = 1$ now. Then Equation (4.3) implies

$$a(r+s) - a(r) - a(s) = \operatorname{Im}\langle\xi(r),\xi(s)\rangle.$$

Note that the left-hand side is symmetric in r and s while the right-hand side is anti-symmetric. Thus the second statement holds. □

Theorem 4.9. *Let $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ be a divisible sum system of finite index and let $(\{H_t\},\{U_{s,t}\})$ be the product system constructed out of the above sum system. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i) *The product system $(H_t, U_{s,t})$ is of type I.*
- (ii) *There exists a linear isomorphism $J : R\mathcal{AU} \to I\mathcal{AU}$ satisfying the following property: the bilinear form $b_G(\cdot, J\cdot)$ is an inner product of $R\mathcal{AU}$, and for each $t > 0$, the operator $J_{t,0}$ extends to a bounded operator J_t on $G_{0,t}$ such that $J_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}, G_{0,t})$.*
- (iii) *There exists a linear isomorphism $J : R\mathcal{AU} \to I\mathcal{AU}$ satisfying the following property: the bilinear form $b_G(\cdot, J\cdot)$ is an inner product of $R\mathcal{AU}$ and the operator $J_{1,0}$ extends to a bounded operator J_1 on $G_{0,1}$ such that $J_1 \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,1}, G_{0,1})$.*

Proof. We set $n = \operatorname{ind} G$.

(i) ⇒ (ii) We assume that the product system $(H_t, U_{s,t})$ is of type I. Then it is isomorphic to an exponential product system ([5]). We first claim that this exponential product system is also of index n. For $t > 0$, let

$$V_t : \Gamma(G_{0,t}) \to \Gamma(L^2((0,t),K))$$

be a family of unitary operators, implementing the isomorphism between the above product systems. Here K is some separable complex Hilbert space. We want to show that the dimension of K is n.

For each $x \in R\mathcal{AU}$ and $y \in I\mathcal{AU}$, the families $\{W(x_t)\}_{t>0}$ and $\{W(iy_t)\}_{t>0}$ form automorphisms for the product system $(H_t, U_{s,t})$ ([6, Theorem 26]) satisfying the relations:

$$W(x_t^{(1)})W(x_t^{(2)}) = W(x_t^{(1)} + x_t^{(2)}), \quad \forall\ x^{(1)}, x^{(2)} \in R\mathcal{AU}, \tag{4.9}$$

$$W(iy_t^{(1)})W(iy_t^{(2)}) = W(iy_t^{(1)} + iy_t^{(2)}), \quad \forall\ y^{(1)}, y^{(2)} \in I\mathcal{AU} \tag{4.10}$$

$$W(x_t)W(iy_t) = e^{-2itb_G(x,y)}W(iy_t)W(x_t), \quad \forall\ x \in R\mathcal{AU},\ \forall\ y \in I\mathcal{AU}. \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore there exists two continuous homomorphisms

$$\rho : R\mathcal{AU} \ni x \mapsto (a(x), \xi(x), u(x)) \in G_K,$$

$$\sigma : I\mathcal{AU} \ni y \mapsto (b(y), \eta(y), v(y)) \in G_K,$$

satisfying

$$V_t W(x_t) V_t^* = e^{ita(x)} W(1_{(0,t]}\xi(x)) \operatorname{Exp}(1_{(0,t]}u(x)), \tag{4.12}$$

$$V_tW(iy_t)V_t^*=e^{itb(y)}W(1_{(0,t]}\eta(y))\mathrm{Exp}\,(1_{(0,t]}v(y)),\tag{4.13}$$

where $1_{(0,t]}$ denotes the characteristic function of the interval $(0,t]$. Equation (4.11) implies that in addition to the relations in Lemma 4.8, we have

$$2b_G(x,y)=\mathrm{Im}\,\langle\eta(y),v(y)\xi(x)\rangle-\mathrm{Im}\,\langle\xi(x),u(x)\eta(y)\rangle,\tag{4.14}$$

$$\xi(x)+u(x)\eta(y)=\eta(y)+v(y)\xi(x),\tag{4.15}$$

$$u(x)v(y)=v(y)u(x).\tag{4.16}$$

Let $w((x,y))=u(x)v(y)$ and $c(x,y)=\xi(x)+u(x)\eta(y)$. Then (4.5) and (4.16) imply that (K,w) is a continuous unitary representation of $R\mathcal{AU}\times I\mathcal{AU}$, and (4.4) and (4.15) imply that c is a continuous 1-cocycle. Let

$$K_0=\{z\in K;\ w(g)z=z,\ \forall g\in R\mathcal{AU}\times I\mathcal{AU}\},$$

and let $K_1=K_0^\perp$. Let $\xi_i(x)$ be the projection of $\xi(x)$ to K_i and let $\eta_i(y)$ be the projection of $\eta(y)$ to K_i. Then Lemma 4.7 implies

$$\langle\xi_1(x),u(x)\eta_1(y)\rangle=\langle\eta_1(y),v(y)\xi_1(x)\rangle,\tag{4.17}$$

and Equation (4.14) is equivalent to

$$b_G(x,y)=\mathrm{Im}\,\langle\eta_0(y),\xi_0(x)\rangle.\tag{4.18}$$

Assume that K_1 is not trivial. Let $0<p<q<t$. Then it is routine work to show

$$V_tW(x_{p,q})V_t^*=e^{i(q-p)a(x)}W(1_{(p,q]}\xi(x))\mathrm{Exp}\,(1_{(0,p]}+1_{(p,q]}u(x)+1_{(q,t]}),$$
$$V_tW(i^ty'_{p,q})V_t^*=e^{i(q-p)b(y)}W(1_{(p,q]}\eta(y))\mathrm{Exp}\,(1_{(0,p]}+1_{(p,q]}v(y)+1_{(q,t]}).$$

By definition of K_1, either $u(x^0)$ or $v(y^0)$ is not trivial for some $x^0\in R\mathcal{AU}$ and $y^0\in I\mathcal{AU}$. Thus we assume that $u(x^0)\neq 1$ (the case with non-trivial $v(y^0)$ can be treated in the same way). Direct computation using Lemma 4.7 and (4.3) shows that the operator $W(1_{(0,t]}\xi_1(x^0))\mathrm{Exp}\,(1_{(0,t]}u(x^0))$ commutes with $V_tW(x_{p,q})V_t^*$ and $V_tW(i^ty'_{p,q})V_t^*$ for all $x\in R\mathcal{AU}$, $y\in I\mathcal{AU}$, and $0<p<q<t$. However, this contradicts the irreducibility of the vacuum representation of the Weyl algebra, since the sets $\{x_{p,q};(p,q)\subseteq(0,t),\ x\in R\mathcal{AU}\}$ and $\{{}^ty'_{p,q};(p,q)\subseteq(0,t),\ y\in I\mathcal{AU}\}$ are total in $G_{0,t}$ due to the divisibility of the sum system. Hence $K=K_0$.

Now assume that $\dim K$ is strictly larger than n. Then there exists non-zero $\zeta\in K$ orthogonal to $\xi(R\mathcal{AU})$ and $\eta(I\mathcal{AU})$ with respect to the real inner product $\mathrm{Re}\,\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$. Again we can show that $W(i1_{(0,t]}\zeta)$ would commutes with $V_tW(x_{p,q})V_t^*$ and $V_tW(i^ty'_{p,q})V_t^*$, for all $x\in R\mathcal{AU}$, $y\in I\mathcal{AU}$, and $0<p<q<t$, which is a contradiction. Therefore we conclude that $\dim K\leq n$.

In the above argument, we have shown the following: there exist continuous homomorphisms $\xi:R\mathcal{AU}\to K$, $\eta:I\mathcal{AU}\to K$, $a:R\mathcal{AU}\to\mathbb{R}$, and $b:I\mathcal{AU}\to\mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$V_tW(x_t)V_t^*=e^{ita(x)}W(1_{(0,t]}\xi(x)),\tag{4.19}$$

$$V_tW(iy_t)V_t^*=e^{itb(y)}W(1_{(0,t]}\eta(y)),\tag{4.20}$$

$$\operatorname{Im}\langle \xi(x^{(1)}), \xi(x^{(2)})\rangle = 0, \quad \forall\, x^{(1)}, x^{(2)} \in R\mathcal{AU}, \tag{4.21}$$

$$\operatorname{Im}\langle \eta(y^{(1)}), \eta(y^{(2)})\rangle = 0, \quad \forall\, y^{(1)}, y^{(2)} \in I\mathcal{AU}, \tag{4.22}$$

$$b_G(x, y) = \operatorname{Im}\langle \eta(y), \xi(x)\rangle, \quad \forall\, x \in R\mathcal{AU},\ \forall\, y \in I\mathcal{AU}. \tag{4.23}$$

Since b_G is non-degenerate, Equation (4.23) shows that ξ and η are injective, and in particular, the real dimension of the image of ξ is n. Thus Equation (4.21) shows that there exists an orthonormal basis $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$ of K consisting of elements in $\xi(R\mathcal{AU})$, and so $\dim K = n$. Let $x^j = \xi^{-1}(e_j)$. Then $\{x^j\}_{j=1}^n$ is a basis of $R\mathcal{AU}$. Let $\{y^j\}_{j=1}^n$ be the dual basis of $\{x^j\}_{j=1}^n$ in $I\mathcal{AU}$ with respect to the bilinear form b_G. Then there exists a real matrix (λ_{jk}) such that

$$\eta(y^j) = ie_j + \sum_{k=1}^n \lambda_{jk} e_k.$$

Moreover, Equation (4.22) implies that the matrix (λ_{jk}) is symmetric. Thus by changing the basis $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$ if necessary, we may and do assume that (λ_{jk}) is diagonal and there exist real numbers λ_j such that

$$\eta(y^j) = (\lambda_j + i)e_j. \tag{4.24}$$

Next we want to get rid of a and b in the above. Let

$$\zeta = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1} b(y^j)\xi(x^j) - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^n a(x^j)\eta(y^j).$$

Then direct computation yields $\operatorname{Im}\langle \zeta, \xi(x^k)\rangle = -a(x^k)/2$ and $\operatorname{Im}\langle \zeta, \eta(y^k)\rangle = -b(y^k)/2$. Now by replacing V_t with $W(1_{(0,t]}\zeta)V_t$, we may and do assume a and b are trivial.

Let $\lambda_j + i = r_j e^{i\theta_j}$ with $r_j > 0$ and $\theta_j \in (0, \pi)$. Let $g \in U(K)$ be the unitary operator determined by $ge_j = e^{i\theta_j}e_j$ for all j. We denote $U_t = V_t^*\operatorname{Exp}(1_{(0,t]}g)V_t$. Then for $0 < p < q < t$, we have

$$U_t W(x^j_{p,q})U_t^* = V_t^* W(\frac{1}{r_j}1_{(p,q]}\eta(y^j))V_t = W(i\frac{1}{r_j}{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q}),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
U_t W(i{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q})U_t^* &= V_t^* W(1_{(p,q]} r_j e^{i2\theta_j} e_j)V_t \\
&= V_t^* W(1_{(p,q]}(2\cos\theta_j r_j e^{i\theta_j} - r_j)e_j)V_t \\
&= V_t^* W(1_{(p,q]}(\xi(-rx^j) + \eta(2\cos\theta_j y^j)))V_t \\
&= e^{-i2(q-p)r_j\cos\theta_j} V_t^* W(1_{(p,q]}\xi(-r_j x^j))V_t V_t^* W(1_{(p,q]}\eta(2\cos\theta_j y^j))V_t \\
&= e^{-i2(q-p)r_j\cos\theta_j} W(-r_j x^j_{p,q})W(i2\cos\theta_j{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q}) \\
&= W(-r_j x_{p,q} + i2\cos\theta_j{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q}).
\end{aligned}$$

We introduce a real linear operator R_0 with domain $D(R_0) = G^0_{0,t} + i{G^0_{0,t}}'$ by setting

$$R_0 x^j_{p,q} = \frac{i}{r_j}{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q}, \quad R_0 i{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q} = -r_j x_{p,q} + i2\cos\theta_j{}^t{y^j}'_{p,q},$$

which preserves the imaginary part of the inner product. Then we have the relation $U_tW(x)U_t^* = W(R_0x)$ for every $x \in D(R_0)$. Let $J : R\mathcal{AU} \to I\mathcal{AU}$ be the linear operator determined by $Jx^j = r_j^{-1}y^j$. Lemma 4.6 implies that R_0 extends to an operator $R \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t} \oplus G_{0,t}, G_{0,t} \oplus G_{0,t})$, and in consequence J_t exists. Moreover, the operator J_t is invertible and R can be expressed in a matrix form as,

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -J_t^{-1} \\ J_t & B \end{pmatrix},$$

where B is the bounded linear extension of the map $i^t{y^j}'_{p,q} \mapsto 2\cos\theta_j i^t{y^j}'_{p,q}$. Thus

$$R^*R = \begin{pmatrix} J_t^*J_t & J_t^*B \\ BJ_t & J_t^{-1*}J_t^{-1} + B^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore $J_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}, G_{0,t})$ and B is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, and in consequence, we have $\cos\theta_j = 0$ for all j. This shows $Jx^j = y^j$ and $b_G(x^j, Jx^k) = \delta_{j,k}$, and so $b_G(\cdot, J\cdot)$ is an inner product (with an orthonormal basis $\{x^j\}_{j=1}^n$).

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) Clear.

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) Assume that there exists a linear isomorphism $J : R\mathcal{AU} \to I\mathcal{AU}$ such that $b_G(\cdot, J\cdot)$ gives an inner product of $R\mathcal{AU}$ and that the bounded extension J_1 of $J_{1,0}$ exists and $J_1 \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,1})$. We first claim $J_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t})$ for each $t \in (0,1)$. Denote $G'_{0,t} = G_{t,1}^{\perp} \cap G_{0,1}$. Notice that $J_1|_{G_{0,t}}$ maps $G_{0,t}$ to $G'_{0,t}$ and $A^*_{t,1-t}$ maps $G'_{0,t}$ to $G_{0,t}$. Now our claim follows immediately from the observation that

$$J_{t,0} = (A^*_{t,1-t}|_{G'_{0,t}})(J_{1,0}|_{G_{0,t}}).$$

With the claim, it is routine work to show that J_t exists and $J_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,1})$ for all $t > 0$.

Since $b_G(\cdot, J\cdot)$ gives an inner product of $R\mathcal{AU}$, we choose an orthonormal basis $\{x^j\}_{j=1}^n$ with respect to this inner product. We set $y^j = Jx^j$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be an n-dimensional real Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$.

Denote

$$L^{(0)}((0,t), \mathcal{K}) = \operatorname{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{1_{(p,q]}\xi : (p,q) \subseteq (0,t),\ \xi \in \mathcal{K}\}$$

which is a dense subspace of the real Hilbert space $L^2((0,t), \mathcal{K})$. Define

$$B_t : G^0_{0,t} \to L^2((0,t), \mathcal{K}),\ B'_t : L^{(0)}((0,t), \mathcal{K}) \to G'_{0,t}$$

by

$$B_t(x^j_{p,q}) = 1_{(p,q]}e_j,\ B'_t(1_{(p,q]}e_j) = {}^t{y^j}'_{p,q},$$

and extend by linearity. Notice that $J_{t,0} = B'_tB_t$. Using Proposition 4.3, we get

$$\langle B_tx^j_{p,q}, 1_{(r,s]}e_k\rangle = \delta_{j,k}|[p,q] \cap [r,s]| = \langle x^j_{p,q}, B'_t1_{(r,s]}e_k\rangle.$$

By taking linear sums, we observe that B_t and B'_t satisfy the adjoint condition on a dense subspace. So for any $x \in G^0_{0,t}$ we have

$$\|B_tx\|^2 = \langle B'_tB_tx, x\rangle \leq \|J_t\|\|x\|^2.$$

which shows that B_t extends to an element in $\mathbb{B}(G_{0,t}, L^2((0,t),\mathcal{K}))$. The operator B'_t also extends to a bounded operator because it is restriction of B_t^*. We use the same symbols B_t and B'_t for their bounded extension. Then we have $B_t^*B_t = J_t$.

Now from our assumption $J_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}, G_{0,t})$ we have $B_t \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,t}, L^2((0,t),\mathcal{K}))$. It is routine verification to see that B_t satisfies

$$B_s \oplus S'_s B_t = B_{s+t}A_{s,t}(1_{G_{0,s}} \oplus S_s|_{G_{0,t}})\ \forall\ s,t \in (0,1),$$

where we have identified $L^2((0,s),\mathcal{K}) \oplus L^2((s,s+t),\mathcal{K})$ with $L^2((0,s+t),\mathcal{K})$. Therefore $(\{G_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ is isomorphic, as sum system, to $(\{L^2((a,b),\mathcal{K})\}), \{S'_t\})$ where $\{S'_t\}$ is the unilateral shift. So $(\{H_t\},\{U_{s,t}\})$ is isomorphic to the exponential product system, and hence type I. □

Remark 4.10. It has been proved in [6, Theorem 39] that only type I and type III product systems can be constructed from divisible sum systems. So thanks to the above Theorem, violating the condition $J_1 \in \mathcal{S}(G_{0,1}, G_{0,1})$ is necessary and sufficient for the associated product system to be of type III. This criterion is much more powerful than the necessary condition for type I already proved in [6, Theorem 40]. In fact we can arrive at that condition just by assuming that J_1 is bounded. Suppose that $E_n \subseteq (0,1)$ be a sequence of elementary sets satisfying $\liminf G_{E_n} = G_{0,1}$. That is, given any $x \in G_{0,1}$ there exists a sequence $\{x_n\}$ satisfying $x_n \in G_{E_n}$ and $x_n \to x$. If we set $y_n = J_1 x_n$, then $y_n \in G_{E_n^c}^{\perp}$. Also if we assume that J_1 is bounded, then y_n converges to $J_1 x$. Thanks to [6, Lemma 28] this would imply that $\limsup G_{E_n^c} = \{0\}$. In Section 6, we will see that there are examples of divisible sum systems of finite index with bounded J_1, which give rise to type III product systems.

5. Additive cocycles

In this section we compute the addits when $G = L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\{S_t\}$ is the shift semigroup. We use the notation $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$ for the set of all real functions in $L^2(0,t)$. We follow the notations in [10] and use many results from there. The reader may refer to the summary of notations and results reviewed at the end of Section 2.

We denote by $\mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ the set of functions $M \in \mathcal{HD}_2$ satisfying $\overline{M(z)} = M(\overline{z})$. We fix $M(z)$ in $\mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ and set $T_t = e^{tA_M}$, and $K_t = T_t - S_t$. With the above condition, the real part $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is preserved by T_t.

As defined in Section 3, for $t > 0$, we set

$$G_{0,t}^M = \{f \in L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}};\ T_t^* f = 0\}$$

and set $G_{0,\infty}^M$ to be $\overline{\bigcup_{t>0} G_{0,t}^M}$. When M is an outer function, one can see that $G_{0,\infty}^M = L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ from [10, Theorem 6.4].

Definition 5.1. A measurable family $\{c_t\}_{t>0}$ of elements in $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be a real additive cocycle for the pair $(\{S_t\},\{T_t\})$, if $c_t \in G_{0,t}^M$ for all $t > 0$, and the cocycle relation $c_{s+t} = c_s + S_s c_t$ holds for all $s,t > 0$. A measurable family $\{d_t\}_{t>0}$ of elements in $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is said to be an imaginary additive cocycle for the pair $(\{S_t\},\{T_t\})$, if $d_t \in L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$ for all $t>0$, and the cocycle relation $d_{s+t} = d_s + T_s d_t$ holds.

Remark 5.2. Clearly the real additive cocycles are same as the real addits for the sum system $(\{G^M_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$, as defined in Section 3.

While proving part (a) in Proposition 3.6, it has been proved, for any $t \geq 0$, that the map $A'_t : G^M_{0,t} \oplus L^2(t,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}} \mapsto L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$, given by $x \oplus y \mapsto x+y$, is in $\mathcal{S}(G^M_{0,t} \oplus L^2(t,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}, L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}})$. If $\{y_t\} \in G^M_{0,t}$ is an imaginary addit for the sum system $(\{G^M_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$, then we have

$$\langle ({A'_t}^*)^{-1} y_t, S_t x\rangle = \langle y_t \oplus 0, 0 \oplus S_t x\rangle = 0, \ \forall\ x \in L^2(0,\infty),$$

and hence $S_t^*({A'_t}^*)^{-1}y_t = 0$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} ({A'_s}^*)^{-1}y_s + T_t({A'_t}^*)^{-1}y_t &= ({A'_s}^*)^{-1}(y_s \oplus S_s({A'_t}^*)^{-1}y_t) \\ &= ({A'_{s+t}}^*)^{-1}((A^*_{s,t})^{-1}(y_s \oplus S_s y_t)) \\ &= ({A'_{s+t}}^*)^{-1}y_{s+t}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above verification (and in the verification below) we have used our earlier observation that $T_t = ({A'_t}^*)^{-1}(A'_t)^{-1}S_t$ (see the proof of Proposition 3.6,(c)) and the associativity of the sum system $(\{G^M_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$. Conversely if $\{d_t\}$ is an imaginary cocycle for $(\{S_t\},\{T_t\})$ then we have

$$\langle {A'_t}^* d_t, 0 \oplus S_t x\rangle = \langle d_t, S_t x\rangle = 0, \ \forall\ x \in L^2(0,\infty),$$

and hence ${A'_t}^* d_t \in G^M_{0,t}$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} (A^*_{s,t})^{-1}({A'_s}^* d_s \oplus S_s {A'_t}^* d_t) &= {A'_{s+t}}^*({A'_{s+t}}^*)^{-1}(A^*_{s,t})^{-1}({A'_s}^* d_s \oplus S_s {A'_t}^* d_t) \\ &= {A'_{s+t}}^*({A'_s}^*)^{-1}\left({A'_s}^* d_s \oplus S_s d_t\right) \\ &= {A'_{s+t}}^*(d_s + T_s d_t) \\ &= {A'_{s+t}}^* d_{s+t}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence an imaginary additive cocycle $\{d_t\}_{t>0}$ for the pair $(\{S_t\},\{T_t\})$ is given by an imaginary addit $\{y_t\}_{t>0}$ of the corresponding sum system $(\{G^M_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ through the bijective correspondence $d_t = ({A'_t}^*)^{-1}y_t$ and vice versa. (The above verification can as well be done without assuming $\{S_t\}$ being semigroup of isometries, by replacing S_t by $(S_t^*)^{-1}$.)

The following lemma is probably well-known. We include a proof here for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\{c_t\}$ be a real additive cocycle. Then $t \mapsto c_t$ is continuous.*

Proof. We regard $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ as a subspace of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ in a natural way. Let $\{U_t\}$ be the shift of $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. By setting $c_t = -U_t c_{-t}$ for negative t, we can extend c to an $\mathbb{R}$-cocycle. Let $V(t) = W(c_t)\mathrm{Exp}\,(U(t)) \in \mathbb{B}(\Gamma(L^2(\mathbb{R})))$. Then $\{V(t)\}$ is a measurable unitary representation of $\mathbb{R}$. It is well-known that such a representation is in fact continuous and so $t \mapsto W(c_t)$ is continuous in the strong operator topology. Thus

$t \mapsto \langle W(c_t)\Phi, \Phi\rangle = e^{-\|c_t\|/2}$ is continuous, where Φ is the vacuum vector. Let P be the projection from $\Gamma(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ onto the one particle subspace of $\Gamma(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$. Then we have $e^{\|c_t\|/2}PW(c_t)\Phi = c_t$ and c_t is continuous. □

Let $\{c_t\}_{t>0}$ be a real additive cocycle. Then Arveson's theorem [5, Theorem 5.3.2] shows that there exists $c \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ such that $c_t = c - S_t c$, where we extend the shift S_t to $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ in an obvious way. Lemma 5.3 and the cocycle relation imply that there exist positive constants a, b such that $||c_t|| \leq a + bt$, and so

$$\int_0^t |c(x)|^2 dx \leq ||c_t||^2 \leq (a+bt)^2.$$

Note that for every $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^\infty |c(x)|^2 e^{-\varepsilon x} dx &= \int_0^\infty e^{-\varepsilon x} \frac{d}{dx}\Big(\int_0^x |c(y)|^2 dy\Big) dx \\ &= \varepsilon \int_0^\infty e^{-\varepsilon x} \int_0^x |c(y)|^2 dy dx < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for $w \in \mathbb{H}_r$, we have

$$0 = (c_t, T_t e_w) = (c - S_t c, S_t e_w + K_t e_w) = \int_0^\infty c(x+t) e^{-xw} dx - \mathcal{L}[c](w) + (c, K_t e_w).$$

Performing the Laplace transformation in the variable t, we get the following from [10, Lemma 3.1] for $z \in \mathbb{H}_r$ with sufficiently large $\operatorname{Re} z$:

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}[c](w) - \mathcal{L}[c](z)}{z - w} - \frac{\mathcal{L}[c](w)}{z} + (c, e_z)(\xi_{M,z}, e_w) = 0,$$

where $\xi_{M,z}$ is as defined in the beginning of [10, Section 3]. Now [10, Lemma 3.3] implies

$$\frac{z\mathcal{L}[c](z)}{M(z)} = \frac{w\mathcal{L}[c](w)}{M(w)},$$

and so $\mathcal{L}[c](z)$ is proportional to $M(z)/z$.

Thanks to the fact that $M(z)/(1+z) \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$, indeed there exists a function c^M such that $c^M e_a \in L^2(0,\infty)$ for all $a > 0$, and $\mathcal{L}[c^M](z) = M(z)/z$. Note that c^M is a real function. We set $c^M_t = c^M - S_t c^M$. Then

$$\mathcal{L}[c^M_t] = \frac{(1 - e^{-tz})M(z)}{z},$$

which belongs to $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. Thus $c^M_t \in L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Tracing back the above argument, we can actually show the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let c^M be a function in $L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ such that $\mathcal{L}[c]^M(z) = M(z)/z$ and let $c^M_t = c^M - S_t c^M$. Then $\{c^M_t\}_{t>0}$ is a real additive cocycle. Every real additive cocycle is a scalar multiple of $\{c^M_t\}_{t>0}$.*

Let $\{d_t\}$ be an imaginary additive cocycle now. The condition $S_t^* d_t = 0$ is equivalent to that the support of d_t is in $(0,t]$. The cocycle relation

$$d_{s+t}(x) = d_s(x) + (K_s d_t)(x) + (S_s d_t)(x)$$

shows that for every $s < x \leq t$, we have $d_{s+t}(x) = d_t(x-s)$ or equivalently, for every $0 < x \leq t$, we have $d_{s+t}(s+t-x) = d_t(t-x)$. This means that there exists a function $d \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ such that $d_t(x) = 1_{(0,t]}(x) d(t-x)$. The cocycle relation is now equivalent to

$$d(t+x) = d(x) + \int_0^t k(x,y) d(t-y) dy, \quad t, x > 0.$$

Note that $t \mapsto \|d_t\|$ is a non-decreasing function. Thanks to the cocycle relation, we can see that

$$t \mapsto \|d_t\|^2 = \int_0^t |d(s)|^2 ds$$

grows at most exponentially and the Laplace transformation $\mathcal{L}[d](z)$ of d exists for z with sufficiently large $\operatorname{Re} z$. Performing the Laplace transformation of the above equation for the two variables t and x we get

$$\frac{\mathcal{L}[d](w) - \mathcal{L}[d](z)}{z-w} = \frac{\mathcal{L}[d](z)}{w} + \mathcal{L}[\xi_{M,z}](w)\mathcal{L}[d](w),$$

which is equivalent to

$$zM(z)\mathcal{L}[d](z) = wM(w)\mathcal{L}[d](w).$$

Thus $\mathcal{L}[d](z)$ should be proportional to $1/(zM(z))$. Indeed, [10, Corollary 4.3] shows that there exists $d^M \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ such that $\mathcal{L}[d^M](z) = 1/(zM(z))$.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $d^M \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty)$ such that $\mathcal{L}[d^M](z) = 1/(zM(z))$ and we set $d^M_t(x) = 1_{(0,t]}(x) d^M(t-x)$. Then $\{d^M_t\}_{t>0}$ is an imaginary additive cocycle. Every imaginary additive cocycle is a scalar multiple of $\{d^M_t\}_{t>0}$.*

Remark 5.6. We set $c^M_{s,t} = S_s c^M_{t-s}$ and $d^M_{s,t} = T_s d^M_{t-s}$ for $0 < s < t$. Then due to Lemma 4.3 (also for instance the relation $\langle c^M_{s+t}, d^M_{s+t}\rangle = \langle c^M_s, d^M_s\rangle + \langle c^M_t, d^M_t\rangle$ can easily be verified), there exists a constant C such that the $\langle c^M_{q,r}, d^M_{s,t}\rangle = C|[q,r] \cap [s,t]|$, where $|.|$ is the Lebesgue measure. As we have

$$\langle c^M_t, d^M_t\rangle = \int_0^t c^M(x) d^M(t-x) dx = c^M * d^M(t),$$

and $\mathcal{L}[c^M * d^M](z) = \mathcal{L}[c^M](z)\mathcal{L}[d^M](z) = 1/z^2$, we actually get $C = 1$ in our case. A similar argument implies that the linear span of $\{d^M_t\}_{t>0}$ is dense in $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Indeed, if $f \in L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is orthogonal to d^M_t for every $t \geq 0$,

$$0 = \langle d^M_t, f\rangle = \int_0^t d^M(t-x) f(x) dx = d^M * f(t),$$

and so

$$0 = \mathcal{L}[d^M * f](z) = \mathcal{L}[d^M](z)\mathcal{L}[f](z) = \frac{\mathcal{L}[f](z)}{zM(z)},$$

for $z \in \mathbb{H}_r$ with sufficiently large $\operatorname{Re} z$. This implies $\mathcal{L}[f](z) = 0$ and $f = 0$.

We will show that the linear span of $\{c^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r<s\leq t}$ is dense in $G^M_{0,t}$ and the linear span of $\{d^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r<s\leq t}$ is dense in $L^2(0,t)$.

Lemma 5.7. *Let $M_I(z)$ be the inner component of $M(z)$ (see* [10, Theorem 4.5]*). Then the closed linear span of $\{c^M_{s,t}\}_{0<s<t<\infty}$ is*

$$\{f \in L^2(0,\infty);\ \mathcal{L}[f] \in M_I H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)\}.$$

Proof. Note that the linear span of $\{c_{s,t}\}_{0<s<t<\infty}$ is an invariant subspace of the shift $\{S_t\}_{t>0}$ and

$$\mathcal{L}[c^M_{s,t}](z) = \frac{(e^{-sz} - e^{-tz})M(z)}{z}.$$

Therefore, the statement follows from the Beurling-Lax theorem [9, page 107]. □

Recall that there exists a measurable function $k(x,y)$ such that

$$K_t f(x) = 1_{(0,t)}(x) \int_0^\infty k(t-x,y) f(y)dy, \quad f \in L^2(0,\infty),$$

and there exists $a > 0$ with

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty |e^{-ax} k(x,y)|^2 dxdy < \infty.$$

[10, Equation 3.1, Lemma 4.1] shows

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty k(x,y) e^{-xz-yw} dxdy = \frac{M(z) - M(w)}{M(z)(z-w)},$$

for $z, w \in \mathbb{H}_r$ with $\operatorname{Re} z > a/2$.

Lemma 5.8. *A function $f \in L^2(0,\infty)_\mathbb{R}$ belongs to ${G^M_{0,\infty}}^\perp$ if and only if there exists a positive number a such that*

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\mathcal{L}[f](-i\lambda) M(i\lambda)}{(z+i\lambda)M(w+i\lambda)} d\lambda = 0$$

holds for all $z, w \in \mathbb{H}_r$ with $\operatorname{Re} w > a$.

Proof. To make sense of the statement, first we claim that for $z, w \in \mathbb{H}_r$ with $\operatorname{Re} w > a$, the function

$$i\lambda \mapsto \frac{M(i\lambda)}{(z+i\lambda)M(w+i\lambda)}$$

belongs to $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. Let $h(x) = \int_0^x e^{-sw} k(s, x-s) ds$. Then since

$$\begin{aligned} |h(x)|^2 &\leq \int_0^x |e^{-as} k(s,x-s)|^2 ds \times \int_0^x e^{-2\operatorname{Re}(w-a)u} du \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\operatorname{Re}(w-a)} \int_0^x |e^{-as} k(s,x-s)|^2 ds, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty dx\int_0^x ds|e^{-as}k(s,x-s)|^2 &= \int_0^\infty ds\int_s^\infty dx|e^{-as}k(s,x-s)|^2\\ &= \int_0^\infty ds\int_0^\infty du|e^{-as}k(s,u)|^2<\infty,\end{aligned}$$

the function h belongs to $L^2(0,\infty)$. In consequence, we have $e_z*h\in L^2(0,\infty)$. On the other hand, for $\zeta\in\mathbb{H}_r$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}[e_z*h](\zeta) &= \frac{1}{z+\zeta}\int_0^\infty dxe^{-x\zeta}\int_0^x dse^{-sw}k(s,x-s)\\ &= \frac{1}{z+\zeta}\int_0^\infty dse^{-sw}\int_s^\infty dxe^{-x\zeta}k(s,x-s)\\ &= \frac{1}{z+\zeta}\int_0^\infty dse^{-s(w+\zeta)}\int_0^\infty dye^{-y\zeta}k(s,y)\\ &= \frac{1}{w(z+\zeta)}(1-\frac{M(\zeta)}{M(w+\zeta)}).\end{aligned}$$

As the function $i\lambda\mapsto 1/(z+i\lambda)$ belongs $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$, we get the claim.

If we interchange S_t and T_t in Lemma 3.5,(ii), we get that the orthogonal complement of $G^M_{0,t}$, which is $\mathrm{Ran}\,(T_t)$, is same as the range of the idempotent $T_tS_t^*$. Hence we conclude that a function $f\in L^2(0,\infty)$ belongs to the orthogonal complement of $G^M_{0,t}$ if and only if

$$f=T_tS_t^*f=(K_tS_t^*+S_tS_t^*)f,\quad t>0.$$

This is equivalent to

$$f(x)=\int_0^\infty k(s,y)f(s+x+y)dy,\quad x,s>0. \tag{5.1}$$

The Plancherel theorem implies that (5.1) is equivalent to

$$f(x)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^\infty \mathcal{L}[k(s,\cdot)](i\lambda)\mathcal{L}[f](-i\lambda)e^{-i\lambda(s+x)}d\lambda. \tag{5.2}$$

Let $z,w\in\mathbb{H}_r$ with $\mathrm{Re}\,w>a$. Then via the Laplace transformation, (5.2) is equivalent to

$$\mathcal{L}[f](z)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^\infty \frac{\mathcal{L}[f](-i\lambda)}{z+i\lambda}\big(1-\frac{M(i\lambda)}{M(w+i\lambda)}\big)d\lambda. \tag{5.3}$$

Note that since $\mathcal{L}[f]\in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}[f](z)=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^\infty\frac{\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)}{z-i\lambda}d\lambda.$$

Thus (5.3) is equivalent to

$$\int_{-\infty}^\infty\frac{\mathcal{L}[f](-i\lambda)}{z+i\lambda}\frac{M(i\lambda)}{M(w+i\lambda)}d\lambda=0.$$

□

Theorem 5.9. *Let the notation be as above. Then*

1. *The linear span of* $\{c^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r,s<t}$ *is dense in* $G^M_{0,t}$.
2. *The linear span of* $\{d^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r,s<t}$ *is dense in* $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. (1) Let $G^{M,c}_{0,t}$ be the closure of the linear span of $\{c^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r<s<t}$, which is a closed subspace of $G^M_{0,t}$. First we show that $G^M_{0,\infty} = G^{M,c}_{0,\infty}$. Note that [10, Corollary 4.3, Theorem 4.5] implies, for $z, w \in \mathbb{H}_r$ with $\operatorname{Re} w$ sufficiently large, that the function

$$i\lambda \mapsto \frac{1}{(z+i\lambda)M(w+i\lambda)}$$

is an outer function in $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. Thus Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.8 imply that

$$G^{M,c\,\perp}_{0,\infty} \subset G^{M\ \perp}_{0,\infty},$$

which shows that $G^M_{0,\infty} = G^{M,c}_{0,\infty}$.

Let $G^{M,c,0}_{0,\infty}$ be the linear span of $\{c^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r<s<\infty}$. Then $G^{M,c,0}_{0,\infty}$ is invariant under the (not necessarily orthogonal) idempotent $1 - S_tT_t^*$ from $L^2(0,\infty)$ onto $G^M_{0,t}$ thanks to Lemma 3.5. Now the statement for finite t follows from Lemma 5.7 and from the fact that $G^M_{0,\infty} = G^{M,c}_{0,\infty}$.

(2) We have already seen that the linear span of $\{d_{r,s}\}_{s>r>0}$ is dense in $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$. A similar argument works using the fact that

$$L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}} + T_tL^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}} = L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$$

is a topological direct sum. □

Corollary 5.10. *The sum system* $(\{G^M_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$ *is divisible and of index 1.*

Remark 5.11. Note that we have

$$\langle c^M_{q,r}, c^M_{s,t}\rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(e^{-iq\lambda}-e^{-ir\lambda})(e^{is\lambda}-e^{it\lambda})|M(i\lambda)|^2}{\lambda^2}d\lambda,$$

which depends only on the outer component of $M(z)$. Since $\{c^M_{q,r}\}_{0<q<r}$ determines the sum system $(\{G^M_{a,b}\},\{S_t\})$, it is isomorphic to the sum system for the outer component of M. On the other hand, the cocycle conjugacy class of the E_0-semigroup arising from $\{e^{tA_M}\}_{t>0}$ is determined by the sum system for M, and so we conclude that the cocycle conjugacy class is determined by the outer component of M. Note that this is in consistence with the fact that $G^M_{0,\infty} = L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ when M is an outer function and with part (c) in Proposition 3.6.

6. Application of the type III criterion

In what follows, we assume that $M \in \mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ is an outer function unless otherwise stated. Then we have $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}} = G^M_{0,\infty}$ and the sum system $\{G^M_{0,t}\}_{t>0}$ coincides with that discussed in [10, Section 6] except that complex Hilbert spaces are considered in [10]. The function $|M(i\lambda)|^2$ corresponds to the spectral density function considered in [19] (see [10, Section 6]).

Let $J^M_{t,0}$ be a linear operator whose domain is the linear span of $\{c^M_{r,s}\}_{0<r<s\leq t}$ sending $c^M_{r,s}$ to $d^M_{r,s}$. When $J^M_{t,0}$ has a bounded extension, we denote it by J^M_t considered as an operator in $\mathbb{B}(G^M_{0,t}, L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}})$. As a consequence of Remark 5.2, we can restate Theorem 4.9 as below.

We choose addits $x = \{x_t\} \in R\mathcal{AU}$ and $y = \{y_t\} \in I\mathcal{AU}$ of the sum system $(\{G^M_{0,t}\}, \{S_t\})$ such that $x_t = c_t$ and $\langle x_t, y_t\rangle = t$. We set J to be the linear map $J : R\mathcal{AU} \to I\mathcal{AU}$ determined by $Jx = y$. Then we have $b_G(x, Jx) = 1$ where b_G is the bilinear form of $R\mathcal{AU} \times I\mathcal{AU}$ defined in Section 4, and so $b_G(\cdot, J\cdot)$ gives an inner product of $R\mathcal{AU}$. Let $J_{t,0}$ be as defined in Section 4. It is not hard to verify that $(A_t'^*)^{-1}({}^t y'_{r,s}) = d^M_{r,s}$, for all $r, s \leq t$. Then the theorem below follows from Theorem 4.9, since

$$J^M_{t,0} = (A_t'^*)^{-1}|_{G^M_{0,t}} J_{t,0} \text{ and } A'_t \in \mathcal{S}(G^M_{0,t} \oplus L^2(t,\infty), L^2(0,\infty)),$$

where A'_t is as defined in Remark 5.2.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $M \in \mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ be an outer function. Then the generalized CCR flow arising from $\{e^{tA_M}\}_{t>0}$ is of type I if and only if the bounded extension J^M_t exists and it is invertible such that for some positive number a, the operator $(J^M_t)^* J^M_t - aI$ is in the Hilbert-Schmidt class for all (some) $t > 0$.*

For a measurable (not necessarily bounded) function F on the imaginary axis, the Toeplitz operator $\mathcal{T}_F$ on $L^2(0,\infty)$ with domain $D(\mathcal{T}_F)$ is defined as follows:

$$D(\mathcal{T}_F) = \{f \in L^2(0,\infty);\ \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F(i\lambda)|^2 |\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda < \infty\},$$

$$(\mathcal{T}_F f)(x) = 1_{(0,\infty)}(x)\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} F(i\lambda)\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)e^{ix\lambda}d\lambda,$$

where the above integral should be appropriately interpreted as usual.

Assume that there exists a bounded operator $J^M \in \mathbb{B}(L^2(0,\infty))$ whose restriction to $G^M_{0,t}$ is J^M_t. Then by construction, we have $J^M S_t = T_t J^M$ and so $S_t^* J^M S_t = J^M$. Such an operator must be a Toeplitz operator (see, for example, [5, Chapter13.3]). Indeed, we can determine the symbol even in the case where the global extension J^M does not exist.

Lemma 6.2. *If $1/\{(1+z)M(z)\} \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$, then $c^M_{s,t}$ is in the domain of $\mathcal{T}_{1/|M|^2}$ for $0 < s < t$ and*

$$\mathcal{T}_{\frac{1}{|M|^2}} c^M_{s,t} = d^M_{s,t}.$$

Proof. The first statement is obvious. To prove the second statement, it suffices to show $\langle \mathcal{T}_{1/|M|^2} c^M_{s,t}, c^M_{q,r}\rangle = \langle d^M_{s,t}, c^M_{q,r}\rangle$ for all $0 < q < r$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \mathcal{T}_{\frac{1}{|M|^2}} c^M_{s,t}, c^M_{q,r}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|M(i\lambda)|^2} \frac{(e^{-is\lambda}-e^{-it\lambda})M(i\lambda)}{i\lambda}\overline{\frac{(e^{-iq\lambda}-e^{-ir\lambda})M(i\lambda)}{i\lambda}}d\lambda \\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{(e^{-is\lambda}-e^{-it\lambda})(e^{iq\lambda}-e^{ir\lambda})}{\lambda^2}d\lambda \\
&= \langle 1_{(s,t]}, 1_{(q,r]}\rangle \\
&= \langle d^M_{s,t}, c^M_{q,r}\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 6.3. The condition $1/\{(1+z)M(z)\} \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$ in the above lemma is automatically satisfied for the class of $\{e^{tA_M}\}$ coming from Tsirelson's off white noises. An off white noise is a generalized Gaussian process with the spectral density functions $e^{\rho(\lambda)}$ (denoted by $W(\lambda)$ in [19]) satisfying the following two conditions (in fact, the first one automatically follows from the second one as we will see below):

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{\rho(\lambda)}}{1+\lambda^2} < \infty, \tag{6.1}$$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\rho(\lambda_1)-\rho(\lambda_2)|^2}{|\lambda_1-\lambda_2|^2} d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 < \infty. \tag{6.2}$$

As described in [10, Section 6], Tsirelson's E_0-semigroup arising from the spectral density function $e^{\rho(\lambda)}$ is conjugate to the generalized CCR flow given by an outer function $M(z)$ with the relation $|M(i\lambda)|^2 = e^{\rho(\lambda)}$. Indeed, given a real function $\rho(\lambda)$ satisfying Equation (6.2), the function $M(z) \in \mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ is obtained by the integral

$$M(z) = \exp\{\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda z + i}{\lambda + iz}\frac{\rho(\lambda)d\lambda}{1+\lambda^2}\}.$$

Via the change of variable $\zeta = (z-1)/(z+1)$, the condition (6.1) is equivalent to that $N(\zeta) = M(z)$ belongs to the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$, where $\mathbb{D}$ is the unit disc, while the condition (6.2) is equivalent to that $\log N(\zeta)$ belongs to the analytic Besov space $B_2(\mathbb{D})$ (see [19] and [21, Chapter 5]). Since we have the inclusion relation $B_2(\mathbb{D}) \subset \mathrm{VMOA}(\mathbb{D})$ (see [21, Lemma 9.4.2]), the condition (6.2) solely implies both (6.1) and $1/N(\zeta) \in H^2(\mathbb{D})$ thanks to [11, page 100], and so $1/\{(1+z)M(z)\} \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$ holds.

Tsirelson [18, Lemma 10.2] shows that if

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\pm\infty} M(i\lambda) = 0,$$

the E_0-semigroup arising from $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$ is of type III. With Theorem 6.1, we can easily treat the other extreme case.

Theorem 6.4. *Let $M \in \mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ be an outer function such that $1/\{(1+z)M(z)\} \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. If*

$$\lim_{\lambda \to \pm\infty} |M(i\lambda)| = \infty,$$

then the generalized CCR flow arising from $\{T_t\}_{t>0}$ is of type III.

Proof. We use the same function as in [18, Lemma 10.1]. For a natural number n, we set

$$f_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(c^M_{\frac{2k}{2n},\frac{2k+1}{2n}} - c^M_{\frac{2k+1}{2n},\frac{2k+2}{2n}} \right) \in G^M_{0,1}.$$

Then $\mathcal{L}[f_n](z) = F_n(z)M(z)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} F_n(z) &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{e^{-\frac{2k+2}{2n}z} + e^{-\frac{2k}{2n}z} - 2e^{-\frac{2k+1}{2n}z}}{z} = \frac{(1-e^{-z})(1-e^{-\frac{z}{2n}})^2}{(1-e^{-\frac{z}{n}})z} \\ &= \frac{(1-e^{-z})(1-e^{-\frac{z}{2n}})}{(1+e^{-\frac{z}{2n}})z}. \end{aligned}$$

The Plancherel theorem applied to the case with $M = 1$ implies

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F_n(i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda = 2\pi.$$

Suppose that J_1^M exists and it is invertible. Then

$$\begin{aligned} ||f_n||^2 &\le ||(J_1^M)^{-1}||^2 ||J_1^M f_n||^2 = ||(J_1^M)^{-1}||^2 ||\mathcal{T}_{\frac{1}{|M|^2}} f_n|| \\ &\le \frac{||(J_1^M)^{-1}||^2}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|F_n(i\lambda)|^2}{|M(i\lambda)|^2} d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

which would imply

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F_n(i\lambda)|^2 |M(i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda \le ||(J_1^M)^{-1}||^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|F_n(i\lambda)|^2}{|M(i\lambda)|^2} d\lambda.$$

However, since the sequence $\{|F_n(z)|^2\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ uniformly converges to 0 on every compact subset of the imaginary axis, we get a contradiction. □

One can also reproduce Tsirelson's result [18, Lemma 10.2] using Theorem 6.1. Indeed, assume that $\lim_{\lambda \to \pm\infty} M(i\lambda) = 0$ and $1/\{(1+z)M(z)\} \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. If $\{T_t\}_{t\ge 0}$ gave a type I E_0-semigroup, a similar computation as above would show that $|(J_1^M f_n, f_n)| \le ||J_1^M|| ||f_n||^2$ and

$$2\pi = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F_n(i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda \le ||J_1^M|| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |F_n(i\lambda)|^2 |M(i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda,$$

which is a contradiction.

Among the spectral density functions treated in [19], the ones to which the above Theorem 6.4 applies are as follows: strictly positive smooth functions such that for large $|\lambda|$, (1) $|M(i\lambda)|^2 = \log^\beta |\lambda|$ for $\beta > 0$, or (2) $|M(i\lambda)|^2 = \exp(a \log^\beta |\lambda|)$ with

$a > 0$ and $0 < \beta < 1/2$. It is quite likely that these families of spectral density functions give rise to mutually non-isomorphic product systems.

Problem 6.5. Show that the product systems arising from the above spectral density functions are mutually non-isomorphic.

Now we treat the case where $|M(i\lambda)|$ converges to a non-zero constant at infinity. Let L_t^M be the restriction of $\mathcal{T}_M$ to $D(\mathcal{T}_M)\cap L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$. We claim that for $f\in D(\mathcal{T}_M)$, the function $M(z)\mathcal{L}[f](z)$ belongs to $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. Recall that a function $F(z)$ belongs to $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$ if and only if $(1+z)F(z)$ belongs to the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D})$ of the unit disc via the change of variable $\zeta=(z-1)/(z+1)$. Since $M(z)/(1+z)$ and $\mathcal{L}[f](z)$ are in $H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$ and $M(i\lambda)\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)$ is square integrable, the function $(1+z)M(z)\mathcal{L}[f](z)$ belongs to $H^1(\mathbb{D})\cap L^2(\mathbb{T})\subset H^2(\mathbb{D})$ and we get the claim. As a consequence, we have $\mathcal{T}_M(1_{(r,s]})=c^M_{r,s}$, and the operator L_t^M is densely defined and its image is dense in $G^M_{0,t}$. We denote by P_t the orthogonal projection from $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$ onto $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Theorem 6.6. *Let M_1, M_2 be (not necessarily outer) functions in $\mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$. We assume that $L_t^{M_i}$ is a bounded invertible operator from $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$ onto $G^{M_i}_{0,t}$ for $i=1,2$. Then the sum system for M_1 and M_2 are isomorphic if and only if there exists a positive constant a such that*

$$L_t^{M_1 *}L_t^{M_1}-aL_t^{M_2 *}L_t^{M_2}$$

is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all (some) $0<t<\infty$.

Proof. Since the sum system for M and $L_t^{M*}L_t^M$ depend only on the outer component of M, we may and do assume that M_1 and M_2 are outer. Since $L_t^{M_1}(L_t^{M_2})^{-1}c_t^{M_2}=c_t^{M_1}$, the two sum systems are isomorphic if and only if there exists a positive constant a such that

$$(L_t^{M_2})^{-1*}(L_t^{M_1})^*L_t^{M_1}(L_t^{M_2})^{-1}-a1$$

is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator in $\mathbb{B}(G^{M_2}_{0,t})$ for all (some) $0<t<\infty$. Since $L_t^{M_2}$ is invertible, this is equivalent to that $(L_t^{M_1})^*L_t^{M_1}-a(L_t^{M_2})^*L_t^{M_2}$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator, which shows the statement. ☐

Theorem 6.7. *Let $M\in\mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$ be an outer function. We assume that there exist two positive constants b_1, b_2 such that $b_1\le|M(i\lambda)|\le b_2$ for almost every λ. Then the semigroup $\{e^{tA_M}\}_{t>0}$ gives rise to a type I E_0-semigroup if and only if there exists a positive constant a such that*

$$P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t-aP_t\mathcal{T}_{1/M}\mathcal{T}^*_{1/M}P_t$$

is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all (some) $0<t<\infty$. If moreover $(I-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0<t<\infty$, then this condition is equivalent to that $P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2-\sqrt{a}}P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt for all $0<t<\infty$.

Proof. By assumption, M and $1/M$ are in $H^\infty(\mathbb{H}_r)$ and $\mathcal{T}_M$ and $\mathcal{T}_{1/M}$ are bounded. We also have $\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}=\mathcal{T}_M^*\mathcal{T}_M$ and $\mathcal{T}_{1/|M|^2}=\mathcal{T}^*_{1/M}\mathcal{T}_{1/M}$. Lemma 6.2 implies that J_t^M is the restriction of $\mathcal{T}_{1/M}^*\mathcal{T}_{1/M}$ to $G_{0,t}^M$. Thus a similar argument as above using Theorem 6.1 implies the first statement.

Now assume that $(I-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0<t<\infty$. Since

$$(P_t\mathcal{T}_{1/M}\mathcal{T}_{1/M}^*P_t)(P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t)=P_t-P_t\mathcal{T}_{1/M}\mathcal{T}_{1/M}^*(I-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t,$$

the operator $P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t$ is the inverse of $P_t\mathcal{T}_{1/M}\mathcal{T}_{1/M}^*P_t$ modulo the Hilbert-Schmidt operators. Thus thanks to the first statement, the semigroup $\{e^{tA_M}\}_{t>0}$ gives rise to a type I E_0-semigroup if and only if there exists a positive constant a such that

$$(P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t)^2-aP_t$$

is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0<t<\infty$, which is equivalent that $P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2-\sqrt{a}I}P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0<t<\infty$. ☐

Note that the assumptions of the above two theorems can be checked by using the Fourier transformation of the symbols in distribution sense.

We now collect a few useful criteria for local boundedness of Toeplitz operators with unbounded symbols.

For $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we denote by $\hat{f}(\xi)$ its Fourier transformation with normalization

$$\hat{f}(\xi)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}f(x)e^{-i\xi x}dx,\quad f\in L^1(\mathbb{R})\cap L^2(\mathbb{R}).$$

The next lemma may be regarded as a version of the well-known uncertainty principle.

Lemma 6.8. *Let E and F be measurable subsets of $\mathbb{R}$ with finite Lebesgue measures $|E|$ and $|F|$ respectively. For $f\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ whose support is in E, we have*

$$\int_F|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2d\xi\le|E||F|||f||^2.$$

Proof. First we assume $f\in L^1(\mathbb{R})\cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$. We take $g\in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\hat{g}$ is the characteristic function of F. Then the Plancherel theorem implies

$$\int_F|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2d\xi=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}|\hat{f}(\xi)\hat{g}(\xi)|^2d\xi=2\pi\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}|f*g(x)|^2dx.$$

On the other hand,

$$|f*g(x)|^2=|\int_E f(t)g(x-t)dt|^2\le||f||^2\int_E|g(x-t)|^2dt,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\int_F|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2d\xi &\le 2\pi||f||^2\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\int_E|g(x-t)|^2dtdx=2\pi||f||^2||g||^2|E|\\ &= ||f||^2|E||F|.\end{aligned}$$

The statement in the general case follows from an easy approximation argument. ☐

Lemma 6.9. *Let* $M \in \mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$. *If there exists* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that the Lebesgue measure of*

$$\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R};\ |M(i\lambda)| \leq \varepsilon\}$$

is finite, then there exists a positive constant C_t *for each* $0 < t < \infty$ *such that*

$$||L_t^M f|| \geq C_t ||f||, \quad \forall f \in L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}} \cap D(\mathcal{T}_M).$$

Proof. Note that we have

$$||\mathcal{T}_M f||^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |M(i\lambda)|^2 |\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda,$$

for $f \in D(\mathcal{T}_M)$ as we have $M(z)\mathcal{L}[f](z) \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$. Let

$$E_n = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R};\ |M(i\lambda)| \leq \frac{1}{n}\}.$$

By assumption, $|E_n|$ is finite for large n. Note that $M(i\lambda) \neq 0$ almost everywhere as $M(z)/(1+z) \in H^2(\mathbb{H}_r)$, which implies that $\{|E_n|\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to 0. For $f \in L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}} \cap D(\mathcal{T}_M)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |M(i\lambda)|^2 |\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda &\geq \int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus E_n} |M(i\lambda)|^2 |\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n}\int_{\mathbb{R}\setminus E_n} |\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda \\ &= \frac{2\pi||f||^2 - \int_{E_n} |\mathcal{L}[f](i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda}{n} \\ &\geq \frac{(2\pi - t|E_n|)||f||^2}{n},\end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma 6.8. Thus for sufficiently large n with $2\pi > t|E_n|$, we get

$$||\mathcal{T}_M f||^2 \geq \frac{2\pi - t|E_n|}{2\pi n}||f||^2,$$

which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 6.10. *Let* $\varphi \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ *and let* $\Phi(i\lambda) = \hat{\varphi}(\lambda)$. *Then* $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}} \subset D(\mathcal{T}_\Phi)$ *and* $\mathcal{T}_\Phi P_t$ *is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all* $0 < t < \infty$.

Proof. Let $f \in L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}} \subset L^1(0,\infty)$, the convolution $\varphi * f$ makes sense as an element in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and we get $\mathcal{T}_\Phi f(x) = 1_{(0,\infty)}(x)\varphi * f(x)$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}_\Phi P_t$ is the integral operator with the kernel $1_{(0,\infty)}(x)\varphi(x-y)1_{(0,t]}(y)$ and so

$$||\mathcal{T}_\Phi P_t||_{\mathrm{H.S}}^2 = \int_0^t\int_0^\infty |\varphi(x-y)|^2 dxdy = \int_{-t}^{\infty} |\varphi(u)|^2\big(t \wedge (t+u)\big)du \leq t||\varphi||^2.$$

□

In a similar way as above, we can show the following:

Lemma 6.11. *Let* $\varphi \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ *and let* $\Phi(i\lambda) = \hat{\varphi}(\lambda)$.

(1) $\mathcal{T}_\Phi$ *is bounded.*
(2) $P_t\mathcal{T}_\Phi P_t$ *is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all* $0 < t < \infty$ *if and only if* $\varphi \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$.
(3) $(1 - P_t)\mathcal{T}_\Phi P_t$ *is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all* $0 < t < \infty$ *if and only if*

$$\int_0^\infty |\varphi(x)|^2(1 \wedge x)dx < \infty.$$

7. EXAMPLES

Let φ be a real function in $L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1dx)$ and let $M = 1 - \mathcal{L}[\varphi]$. Then M belongs to $\mathcal{HD}_{2,\mathbb{R}}$. We determine the type of the generalized CCR flow arising from such M.

Lemma 7.1. *Let the notation be as above. Then* L^M_t *is a bounded invertible operator from* $L^2(0,t)_\mathbb{R}$ *onto* $G^M_{0,t}$ *for all* $0 < t < \infty$.

Proof. Let $\varphi_1(x) = 1_{(0,1]}(x)\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi_2(x) = 1_{(1,\infty)}(x)\varphi(x)$. Then $\varphi_1 \in L^1(0,\infty)$ and $\varphi_2 \in L^2(0,\infty)$, and so Lemma 6.9, Lemma 6.10, and Lemma 6.11 imply the statement. □

Lemma 7.2. *Let the notation be as above. For a natural number* n, *we set*

$$g_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left(1_{(\frac{2k}{2n},\frac{2k+1}{2n}]}(x) - 1_{(\frac{2k+1}{2n},\frac{2k+2}{2n}]}(x)\right).$$

Then $\{\mathcal{T}_M g_n - g_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ *converges to 0.*

Proof. Note that $\mathcal{L}[g_n](z) = F_n(z)$ holds, where F_n is as in the proof of Theorem 6.4. Let $\Phi_i(z) = \mathcal{L}[\varphi_i](z)$ for $i = 1, 2$, where $\varphi = \varphi_1 + \varphi_2$ is the decomposition as in the proof of Lemma 7.1. Then $\mathcal{T}_M g_n - g_n = -\mathcal{T}_{\Phi_1} g_n - \mathcal{T}_{\Phi_2} g_n$. Since $\{g_n\}$ converges to 0 weakly, the second term converges to 0 as $\mathcal{T}_{\Phi_2}P_1$ is a compact operator thanks to Lemma 6.10. Since $\Phi_1(i\lambda)$ is a continuous function vanishing at infinity, we get

$$||\mathcal{T}_{\Phi_1} g_n||^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^\infty |\Phi_1(i\lambda)|^2|F_n(i\lambda)|^2 d\lambda \to 0, \quad (n \to \infty).$$

□

Lemma 7.3. *Let* $f, g, h \in L^1(0,1) \cap L^2((0,1), xdx)$. *We regards* $L^1(0,1)$ *as a subspace of* $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ *naturally and set* $\tilde{g}(x) = g(-x)$. *If* $f, h \notin L^2(0,1)$ *such that*

$$\limsup_{t\to+0} \frac{||h||_{L^2(t,1)}}{||f||_{L^2(t,1)}} = C < \infty,$$

then

$$\lim_{t\to+0} \frac{||h * \tilde{g}||_{L^2(t,1)}}{||f||_{L^2(t,1)}} = 0.$$

Proof. Let $0 < t, \varepsilon < 1$ with $t + \varepsilon < 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
||h * \tilde{g}||^2_{L^2(t,1)} &\leq \int_t^1 dx \int_0^1 dr \int_0^1 ds |g(r)||g(s)||h(x+r)||h(x+s)| \\
&\leq \int_t^1 dx \int_0^1 dr \int_0^1 ds |g(r)||g(s)| \frac{|h(x+r)|^2 + |h(x+s)|^2}{2} \\
&= ||g||_1 \int_t^1 dx \int_0^1 dr |g(r)||h(x+r)|^2 \\
&= ||g||_1 \int_0^{1-t} |g(r)|||h||^2_{L^2(t+r,1)} dr \\
&\leq ||g||_1 \int_0^{\varepsilon} |g(r)| dr ||h||^2_{L^2(t,1)} + ||g||_1^2 ||h||^2_{L^2(\varepsilon,1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\limsup_{t \to +0} \frac{||h * \tilde{g}||_{L^2(t,1)}}{||f||_{L^2(t,1)}} \leq C ||g||_1 \int_0^{\varepsilon} |g(r)| dr,$$

and the statement holds. □

Theorem 7.4. *Let* $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in L^1_{\text{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1 dx)_{\mathbb{R}}$ *and let* $M_i = 1 - \mathcal{L}[\varphi_i]$ *for* $i = 1, 2$.

1. *If* $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \in L^2(0,\infty)$*, the two sum systems for* M_1 *and* M_2 *are isomorphic.*
2. *Assume* $\varphi_1 \notin L^2(0,\infty)$*. If the two sum systems for* M_1 *and* M_2 *are isomorphic, then the following two statements hold:*

$$\lim_{t \to +0} \frac{||\varphi_2||_{L^2(t,\infty)}}{||\varphi_1||_{L^2(t,\infty)}} = 1, \tag{7.1}$$

$$\lim_{t \to +0} \frac{||\varphi_1 - \varphi_2||_{L^2(t,\infty)}}{||\varphi_1||_{L^2(t,\infty)}} = 0. \tag{7.2}$$

Proof. Lemma 7.1 shows that $L_t^{M_i}$ is a bounded invertible operator from $L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$ onto $G^{M_i}_{0,t}$. Therefore we can apply Theorem 6.6 to prove the theorem.

(1) Assume that $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \in L^2(0,\infty)$. Lemma 6.10 implies that $L_t^{M_1} - L_t^{M_2}$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0 < t < \infty$ and Theorem 6.6 shows that the sum systems for M_1 and M_2 are isomorphic.

(2) Assume now that the sum systems for M_1 and M_2 are isomorphic. By the result just proved above, we may add a function in $L^2(0,\infty)$ to φ_i without changing the assumption. Therefore we may and do assume that φ_i has support in $(0,1)$ and $||\varphi_i||_1 < 1$ by truncating φ_i. As a consequence, $\mathcal{T}_{M_i}$ is a bounded operator and we have $(L_t^{M_i})^* L_t^{M_i} = P_t \mathcal{T}_{|M_i|^2} P_t$ now. Assume that $\varphi_1 \notin L^2(0,1)$.

Theorem 6.6 implies that there exists a positive constant a such that $P_t \mathcal{T}_{|M_1|^2 - a|M_2|^2} P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0 < t < \infty$. This is possible only if $a = 1$ thanks to Lemma 7.2. Let $\Phi_i = \mathcal{L}[\varphi_i]$. Then

$$|M_1|^2 - |M_2|^2 = \Phi_2 - \Phi_1 + \overline{\Phi_2} - \overline{\Phi_1} + |\Phi_1|^2 - |\Phi_2|^2,$$

and we have $\mathcal{T}_{|M_1|^2-|M_2|^2} f = 1_{(0,\infty)}(x) g * f(x)$ for $f \in L^2(0,\infty)$ with

$$g = \varphi_2 - \varphi_1 + \tilde{\varphi}_2 - \tilde{\varphi}_1 + \tilde{\varphi}_1 * \varphi_1 - \tilde{\varphi}_2 * \varphi_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}),$$

where the notation in Lemma 7.3 is used. Lemma 6.11 implies that $g \in L^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ or equivalently $g \in L^2([-1,1])$ as g is supported by $[-1,1]$. Setting $h = \varphi_2 - \varphi_1$, we have

$$g = h + \tilde{h} - h * \tilde{h} - \varphi_1 * \tilde{h} - h * \tilde{\varphi}_1.$$

First suppose that (7.1) does not hold. Exchanging the roles of φ_1 and φ_2 if necessary, we may assume that there exist a number $0 < \delta < 1$ and a decreasing sequence of positive numbers $\{t_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converging to 0 such that

$$||\varphi_2||_{L^2(t_n,1)} \leq (1-\delta)||\varphi_1||_{L^2(t_n,1)}$$

holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $||h||_{L^2(t_n,1)} \geq \delta||\varphi_1||_{L^2(t_n,1)}$. On the other hand we have

$$1 = \frac{||g + h * \tilde{h} + \varphi_1 * \tilde{h} + h * \tilde{\varphi}_1||_{L^2(t_n,1)}}{||h||_{L^2(t_n,1)}},$$

whose right-hand side would converge to 0 due to Lemma 7.3, which is a contradiction. Thus Equation (7.1) holds.

Equation (7.2) can be shown in a similar way in the presence of (7.1). □

Theorem 7.5. *Let $\varphi \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), x \wedge 1dx)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and let $M = 1 - \mathcal{L}[\varphi]$. Then the generalized CCR flow arising from $\{e^{tA_M}\}_{t>0}$ is of type I if and only if $\varphi \in L^2(0,\infty)$. In consequence, if $\varphi \notin L^2(0,\infty)$, then the corresponding generalized CCR flow is of type III.*

Proof. Thanks to Theorem 7.4, (1), to prove the theorem we may assume that φ is supported by $(0,1)$ and $||\varphi||_1 < 1$. In this case, the function $M(z)$ is continuous and

$$1 - ||\varphi||_1 \leq |M(z)| \leq 1 + ||\varphi||_1$$

holds on the closure of $\mathbb{H}_r$. In particular M is an outer function. Therefore we can apply Theorem 6.7 to $M(z)$.

First we claim that $(1-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all $0 < t < \infty$. Let $\Phi = \mathcal{L}[\varphi]$. Then

$$(1-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_t = -(1-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{\Phi}P_t - (1-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{\overline{\Phi}}P_t + (1-P_t)\mathcal{T}_{|\Phi|^2}P_t.$$

Thanks to Lemma 6.11, the first two terms above are Hilbert-Schmidt operators. Note that we have $\mathcal{T}_{|\Phi|^2} f = 1_{(0,\infty)}\varphi * \tilde{\varphi} * f$ for $f \in L^2(0,\infty)$. Thus to prove the claim, it suffices to show that

$$\int_0^1 t|\varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(t)|^2 dt < \infty.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 x|\varphi*\tilde{\varphi}(x)|^2dx &\leq \int_0^1 xdx\int_0^1 dr\int_0^1 ds|\varphi(r)||\varphi(s)||\varphi(x+r)||\varphi(x+s)| \\ &\leq \int_0^1 xdx\int_0^1 dr\int_0^1 ds|\varphi(r)||\varphi(s)|\frac{|\varphi(x+r)|^2+|\varphi(x+s)|^2}{2} \\ &= ||\varphi||_1\int_0^1 xdx\int_0^1 ds|\varphi(s)||\varphi(x+s)|^2 \\ &= ||\varphi||_1\int_0^1 ds|\varphi(s)|\int_s^1 dy(y-s)|\varphi(y)|^2 \\ &\leq ||\varphi||_1^2\int_0^1 x|\varphi(x)|^2dx<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.7 together with the above claim shows that the generalized CCR flow arising from $\{e^{tA_M}\}_{t>0}$ is of type I if and only if $P_t\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2-1}P_t$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator for all t, which is further equivalent to that

$$g=\varphi*\tilde{\varphi}-\varphi-\tilde{\varphi}$$

is in $L^2(-1,1)$ thanks to Lemma 6.11,(2). Lemma 7.3 shows that this is equivalent to the condition $\varphi\in L^2(0,1)$. □

Remark 7.6. Let φ be as above and $||\varphi||_1<1$. Then as shown in [10, Section 6], the sum system $G^M_{0,t}$ can be realized as follows: $G^M_{0,t}=L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}$ as a topological vector space with a new inner product

$$\langle f,g\rangle_G=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\hat{f}(\lambda)\overline{\hat{g}(\lambda)}|M(i\lambda)|^2d\lambda.$$

Note that the norm of $G^M_{0,t}$ is equivalent to the usual L^2-norm as we have

$$1-||\varphi||_1\leq|M(i\lambda)|\leq 1+||\varphi||_1.$$

This means that the invariant for a product system (through the associated sum system) discussed in [18] and [6] can not distinguish the product system corresponding to this M from the exponential product system of index 1.

8. TYPE III FACTORS AND TYPE III E_0-SEMIGROUPS

8.1. **Local algebras.** For a product system $E=(E_t)_{t>0}$, following [12], [18] and [6], we introduce an analogue of the observable algebra for a finite interval $I=(s,t)\subset(0,a)$ by

$$\mathcal{A}^E(I) \ = \ U^a_{s,t}\ (\mathbb{C}1_{E_s}\otimes\mathbb{B}(E_{t-s})\otimes\mathbb{C}1_{E_{a-t}})U^{a}_{s,t}{}^*,$$

where $U^a_{s,t}$ is the unique unitary operator between the Hilbert spaces $E_s\otimes E_{t-s}\otimes E_{a-t}$ and H_a, determined uniquely by the associativity of the product system.

For a family $\{\mathcal{A}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ of von Neumann algebras, we use the notation $\bigvee_{\lambda\in\Lambda}\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ for the von Neumann algebra generated by $\{\mathcal{A}_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$. For an open subset U of $(0,a)$, we set

$$\mathcal{A}^E(U)=\bigvee_{I\subset U}\mathcal{A}^E(I)$$

where I runs over all intervals contained in U. Then the isomorphism class of $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ does not depend on the choice of a.

Note that we can always ignore a finite subset of $(0,\infty)$ whenever we deal with $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ as we have $\mathcal{A}^E((r,s)\cup(s,t))=\mathcal{A}^E((r,t))$ (see for instance Corollary 25 in [6]).

When U is an elementary set, that is a finite union of intervals, then $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is a type I factor because it is generated by finitely many mutually commuting type I factors. However, when U has infinitely many components, it is not clear whether $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is of type I or even it is not clear whether $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is a factor. Indeed, Murray von Neumann's notion of the type of $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ gives a computable invariant of the product system $(E_t)_{t>0}$.

Lemma 8.1. *Let $E=(E_t)_{t>0}$ be a product system and let U be a bounded non-empty open subset of $(0,\infty)$. Then*

1. *If E has a unit, then $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ has a direct summand that is a type I_∞ factor.*
2. *If E is of type I, then $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is a type I_∞ factor.*

Proof. (1) We choose $a>0$ such that $U\subset(0,a)$ and assume that $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ acts on E_a. Since U is open, there exist mutually disjoint open intervals I_n such that $U=\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty I_n$. Let $v=(v_t)_{t>0}$ be a unit. Then we may and do assume that $||v_t||=1$ for all $t>0$. Let $L=\overline{\mathcal{A}^E(U)v_a}$ and P_L be the projection from E_a onto L, which belongs to $\mathcal{A}^E(U)'$. We introduce a state ω of $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ by $\omega(x)=\langle xv_1,v_1\rangle$. Then for $x_i\in\mathcal{A}^E(I_i)$, we have

$$\omega(x_1x_2\cdots x_n)=\omega(x_1)\omega(x_2)\cdots\omega(x_n),$$

which shows that ω is a product pure state of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n\mathcal{A}(I_i)\subset\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ for all n. Therefore $\mathcal{A}^E(U)P_L$ is a type I_∞ factor.

(2) We may assume that E is the exponential product system with the test function space $L^2((0,\infty),K)$, where K is the multiplicity space. Then $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is nothing but $\mathbb{B}(\Gamma(L^2(U,K)))$. □

Remark 8.2. If E has a unit and $U=\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty(a_n,b_n)$ with $b_n<a_{n+1}$, then it is easy to show that $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is a type I factor. Indeed, using the notation of the proof of (1) above, we have

$$\overline{\mathcal{A}^E(U)'L}=E(0,a)$$

in this case. Therefore the defining representation of $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is quasi-equivalent to its restriction to L.

8.2. **Type of $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$.** We fix $\varphi \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), 1 \wedge x dx)_{\mathbb{R}} \setminus L^2(0,\infty)$ and set $\Phi = \mathcal{L}[\varphi]$, $M = 1 - \Phi$. Let $H = \Gamma(L^2(0,\infty))$ and α^φ be the E_0-semigroup acting on $\mathbb{B}(H)$ defined by

$$\alpha^\varphi_t(W(f+ig)) = W(S_t + iT_t g), \quad f, g \in L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Then α^φ is of type III as we saw in Theorem 6.7. Since the cocycle conjugacy class of α^φ does not change under a L^2-perturbation of φ, we assume that φ is supported by $[0,1)$ and $||\varphi||_1 < 1/3$. Note that the Toeplitz operator $\mathcal{T}_M$ is a bounded invertible operator with $\mathcal{T}_M^{-1} = \mathcal{T}_{1/M}$ in this case.

Let E^φ be the product system for α^φ and $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U) := \mathcal{A}^{E^\varphi}(U)$. Then we may and do identify $\mathcal{A}^\varphi((0,t))$ with $\alpha^\varphi_t(\mathbb{B}(H))'$ and $\mathcal{A}^\varphi((s,t))$ with $\alpha^\varphi_s(\mathcal{A}^\varphi((0,t-s)))$.

Lemma 8.3. *Let the notation be as above. Then*

$$\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U) = \{W(\mathcal{T}_M f + i\mathcal{T}_M^{*-1} g);\ f, g \in L^2(U)_{\mathbb{R}}\}''.$$

In consequence, the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is either a type I factor or a type III factor.

Proof. Let $I = (s,t)$ be an open interval. When $s = 0$, using the duality theorem [1, Theorem 1',(5)], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^\varphi(0,t) &= \{W(S_t f + iT_t g);\ f, g \in L^2(0,\infty)_R\}' \\ &= \{W(f + ig);\ f \in G^M_{0,t},\ g \in L^2(0,t)_{\mathbb{R}}\}''. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mathcal{A}^\varphi((s,t)) = \{W(S_s f + iT_s g);\ f \in G^M_{0,t-s},\ g \in L^2(0,t-s)_{\mathbb{R}}\}'',$$

and thanks to Theorem 5.9,

$$\mathcal{A}^\varphi((s,t)) = \{W(\xi c_{x,y} + i\eta d_{u,v});\ s < x < y < t,\ s < u < v < t,\ \xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}\}''.$$

Note that we have $c_{x,y} = \mathcal{T}_M 1_{(x,y)}$ and

$$d_{u,v} = \mathcal{T}_{1/|M|^2} c_{u,v} = \mathcal{T}^*_{1/M}\mathcal{T}_{1/M} c_{u,v} = \mathcal{T}_M^{*-1} 1_{(s,t)},$$

and so we get

$$\mathcal{A}^\varphi(I) = \{W(\mathcal{T}_M f + i\mathcal{T}_M^{*-1} g);\ f, g \in L^2(I)_{\mathbb{R}}\}''.$$

For an open subset U of $(0,1)$, we take mutually disjoint open intervals I_n such that $U = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty I_n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^\varphi(U) &= \bigvee_{n=1}^\infty \{W(\mathcal{T}_M f + i\mathcal{T}_M^{*-1} g);\ f, g \in L^2(I_n)_{\mathbb{R}}\}'' \\ &= \{W(\mathcal{T}_M f + i\mathcal{T}_M^{*-1} g);\ f, g \in L^2(U)_{\mathbb{R}}\}''. \end{aligned}$$

Let $K_1 = \mathcal{T}_M L^2(U)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $K_2 = \mathcal{T}_M^{-1*} L^2(U)_{\mathbb{R}}$, which are closed spaces of $L^2(0,\infty)_{\mathbb{R}}$. To show that $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is a factor, it suffices to show that $K_1 \cap K_2^\perp = K_1^\perp \cap K_2 = \{0\}$ (see [1, Theorem 1',(4)]). This immediately follows from $\langle \mathcal{T}_M f, \mathcal{T}_M^{-1*} g\rangle = \langle f, g\rangle$. The rest of the statement follows from [2]. □

Let K_1 and K_2 be as above. It is shown in [1, Lemma 4.1], [2] that there exists an unique closed operator $V : K_1 \to K_1^\perp$ such that K_2 is the graph of V. Moreover, the factor $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is of type I (resp. type III) if and only if V is (resp. is not) a Hilbert-Schmidt class operator. (Though $K_1 \cap K_2 = K_1^\perp \cap K_2^\perp = \{0\}$ is also assumed in [1], it is not really necessary.)

Lemma 8.4. *Let the notation be as above and let P_U be the projection onto $L^2(U)_\mathbb{R}$. Then V is the restriction of $-\mathcal{T}_M^{-1*}(I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_M^*$ to K_1. In consequence, the factor $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is of type I if and only if $(I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_{\Phi+\overline{\Phi}-|\Phi|^2}P_U$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt class operator.*

Proof. Let $V_0 := -\mathcal{T}_M^{-1*}(I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_M^*|_{K_1}$. For $f, g \in L^2(U)_\mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\langle V_0\mathcal{T}_M f, \mathcal{T}_M g\rangle = -\langle (I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_M^*\mathcal{T}_M f, g\rangle = 0,$$

which shows that V_0 is a bounded operator from K_1 to $K_1^\perp$. Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_M f + V_0\mathcal{T}_M f = \mathcal{T}_M f - \mathcal{T}_M^{-1*}(I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_M^*\mathcal{T}_M f = \mathcal{T}_M^{-1*}P_U\mathcal{T}_M^*\mathcal{T}_M f \in K_2.$$

Therefore to prove that $V = V_0$, it suffices to show that $P_U\mathcal{T}_M^*\mathcal{T}_M P_U$ is invertible in $\mathbb{B}(L^2(U))$. Since

$$\mathcal{T}_M^*\mathcal{T}_M = I - \mathcal{T}_\Phi - \mathcal{T}_\Phi^* + \mathcal{T}_\Phi^*\mathcal{T}_\Phi,$$

this follows from $||\mathcal{T}_\Phi|| \le ||\varphi||_1 < 1/3$.

Since $\mathcal{T}_M P_U$ is an invertible operator from $L^2(U)_\mathbb{R}$ onto K_1, we conclude that V is a Hilbert-Schmidt class operator if and only if

$$\mathcal{T}_M^* V\mathcal{T}_M P_U = -(I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_{|M|^2}P_U = (I-P_U)\mathcal{T}_{\Phi+\overline{\Phi}-|\Phi|^2}P_U$$

is a Hilbert-Schmidt class operator. □

For two subsets E, F of $\mathbb{R}$, we denote by $E \ominus F$ the symmetric difference of E and F.

Theorem 8.5. *Let $\varphi \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0,\infty) \cap L^2((0,\infty), 1 \wedge xdx)_\mathbb{R}$, and let U be a bounded open subset of $(0,\infty)$. We regards φ as an element of $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and set $\tilde{\varphi}(x) = \varphi(-x)$. Then $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is a type I factor (resp. type III factor) if and only if the integral*

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \int_0^1 |\varphi(x) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(x)|^2 |(U+x) \ominus U| dx$$

converges (resp. diverges). When there exists $a > 0$ such that $\varphi(x)$ is monotone on $(0,a)$, the above integral converges if and only if the integral

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \int_0^1 |\varphi(x)|^2 |(U+x) \ominus U| dx$$

converges.

Proof. Note that the isomorphism class of $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ and whether $\mathcal{I}_1$ is finite or not are stable under L^2-perturbation of φ. Therefore we may and do assume that φ is supported by $[0,1]$ and $||\varphi||_1 < 1/3$. Then thanks to Lemma 8.4, the factor $\mathcal{A}^E(U)$ is of type I if and only if

$$\mathcal{I}_3 := \int_{(0,\infty)\setminus U} dx \int_U dy |\varphi(x-y) + \tilde{\varphi}(x-y) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(x-y)|^2 < \infty,$$

because $(I - P_U)\mathcal{T}_{\Phi+\overline{\Phi}-|\Phi|^2}P_U$ is the integral operator with the kernel

$$(\varphi(x-y) + \tilde{\varphi}(x-y) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(x-y))1_{(0,\infty)\setminus U}(x)1_U(y).$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_3 &= \int_{-1}^1 |\varphi(s) + \tilde{\varphi}(s) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(s)|^2 |([0,\infty)\setminus U) \cap (U+s)| ds \\
&= \int_0^1 |\varphi(s) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(s)|^2 \big(|([0,\infty)\setminus U) \cap (U+s)| + |([0,\infty)\setminus U) \cap (U-s)|\big) ds \\
&= \int_0^1 |\varphi(s) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(s)|^2 (|(U+s) \ominus U| - |[0,s] \cap U|) ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_0^1 |\varphi(s) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(s)|^2 |[0,s] \cap U| ds \leq \int_0^1 |\varphi(s) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(s)|^2 s ds < \infty,$$

we get the first statement.

Assume now that φ is monotone on $(0,a)$. When $\lim_{x\to+0}\varphi(x)$ is finite, the function φ is in $L^1(0,\infty) \cap L^2(0,\infty)$ and $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ are finite. Assume that the limit at 0 does not exist. Then by truncating φ if necessary, we may assume that either $\varphi(x)$ is non-negative and decreasing or $\varphi(x)$ is non-positive and increasing. Assume that $\varphi(x)$ is non-negative and decreasing. (The other case can be treated in a similar way.) Then for $0 < x < 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(x) &\geq \varphi(x) - \varphi * \tilde{\varphi}(x) = \varphi(x) - \int_0^1 \varphi(x+t)\varphi(t) dt \\
&\geq \varphi(x) - \varphi(x) \int_0^1 \varphi(t) dt = (1 - ||\varphi||_1)\varphi(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{I}_1$ is finite if and only if $\mathcal{I}_2$ is finite. □

When U is an elementary set, we have $|(U+x) \ominus U| = O(x)$, $(x \to 0)$ and $\mathcal{I}_1$ is always finite, which recovers the fact that $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is a type I factor. To construct U such that $\mathcal{A}^\varphi(U)$ is of type III, we have to control the speed of convergence of $\lim_{x\to+0} |(U+x) \ominus U| = 0$.

Lemma 8.6. *Let $f(x)$ be a non-negative strictly decreasing continuous function on $(0,\infty)$ satisfying $\lim_{x\to+0} f(x) = \infty$, $\lim_{x\to\infty} f(x) = 0$, and*

$$\int_0^1 f(x) dx < \infty.$$

We set $a_0 = 0$, $a_{2n-1} = a_{2n} = f^{-1}(n)$ *for* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *and* $b_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k$. *Let* $I_n = (b_{2n}, b_{2n+1})$ *and* $U = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} I_n$. *Then* U *is a bounded open set and the following estimate holds for every* $0 < x < f^{-1}(1)$*:*

$$(2f(x) - 1)x \leq |(U + x) \ominus U| \leq (2f(x) + 1)x + 2\int_0^x f(s)ds.$$

Proof. Note that we have

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(k) \leq \int_0^{f^{-1}(n+1)} f(s)ds - nf^{-1}(n+1)$$

and in particular, the set U is bounded. For $0 < x \leq f^{-1}(1)$, we choose n so that $f^{-1}(n+1) < x \leq f^{-1}(n)$, which is equivalent to $n \leq f(x) < n+1$. Then we have

$$nx \leq |(U + x) \setminus U| \leq nx + \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} |I_k|,$$

$$(n+1)x \leq |(U - x) \setminus U| \leq (n+1)x + \sum_{k=n+2}^{\infty} |I_k|,$$

and so

$$(2n+1)x \leq |(U + x) \ominus U| \leq (2n+1)x + 2\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(k).$$

Since $f(x) - 1 < n$, we get the lower estimate. Since

$$\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} f^{-1}(k) \leq \int_0^{f^{-1}(n+1)} f(s)ds - nf^{-1}(n+1) \leq \int_0^x f(s)ds$$

and $n \leq f(x)$, we get the upper estimate. □

For two real valued functions $h(x)$ and $g(x)$ on $(0, \infty)$, we denote $h(x) \asymp g(x)$ if there exist positive numbers $a, b, c > 0$ such that

$$bh(x) \leq g(x) \leq ch(x), \quad \forall x \in (0, a).$$

Corollary 8.7. *Assume that* $f(x) = x^{\gamma-1}L(x)$ *satisfies the assumption of Lemma 8.6 such that* $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ *and* $L(x)$ *is a slowly varying function (see* [8] *for the definition). If* U *is a bounded open subset of* $(0, \infty)$ *constructed from* f *in Lemma 8.6, then*

$$|(U + x) \ominus U| \asymp x^{\gamma}L(x).$$

For $0 < \beta \leq 1/2$, we set $\varphi_\beta(x) = x^{\beta-1}e^{-x}$. Then φ_β satisfies the assumption of Theorem 8.5. Corollary 8.7 shows that for any $0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 \leq 1/2$, there exists a bounded open set $U \subset (0, \infty)$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{\varphi_{\beta_1}}(U)$ is a type III factor and $\mathcal{A}^{\varphi_{\beta_2}}(U)$ is a type I factor. In particular $\alpha^{\varphi_{\beta_1}}$ and $\alpha^{\varphi_{\beta_2}}$ are not cocycle conjugate.

Theorem 8.8. *There exist uncountably many mutually non-cocycle conjugate type III* E_0*-semigroups of the form* α^{φ} *with* $\varphi \in L^1_{\mathrm{loc}}[0, \infty) \cap L^2((0, \infty), 1 \wedge x dx)_{\mathbb{R}}$.

References

[1] H. Araki, *A lattice of von Neumann algebras associated with the quantum theory of a free Bose field.* J. Math. Phys. **4** (1963), 1343–1362.

[2] H. Araki, *Type of von Neumann algebra associated with free Bose field,* Progr. Theoret. Phys. **32**, (1964), 956–965.

[3] H. Araki, *On quasifree states of the canonical commutation relations. II.* Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **7** (1971/72), 121–152.

[4] W. Arveson, *Continuous analogues of Fock spaces*, Mem. Americ. Math. Soc. 80(409):1-66, 1989.

[5] W. Arveson, *Non-commutative dynamics and E-semigroups*, Springer Monograph in Math. (Springer 2003).

[6] B. V. Rajarama Bhat and R. Srinivasan, *On product systems arising from sum systems* Infinite dimensional analysis and related topics, Vol. 8, Number 1, March 2005.

[7] A. van Daele, *Quasi-equivalence of quasi-free states on the Weyl algebra.* Comm. Math. Phys. **21** (1971), 171–191.

[8] W. Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications. Vol. II.* Second edition, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York-London-Sydney 1971.

[9] K. Hoffman, *Banach Spaces of Analytic Functions.* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J. 1962.

[10] M. Izumi, *A perturbation problem for the shift semigroup,* Preprint math/0702439, 2007.

[11] P. Koosis, *Introduction to H^p Spaces.* Second edition. With two appendices by V. P. Havin. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 115. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

[12] V. Liebscher, *Random sets and invariants for (type II) continuous product systems of Hilbert spaces*, Preprint math.PR/0306365.

[13] K. R. Parthasarathy, *An Introduction to Quantum Stochastic Calculus*, Birkauser Basel, Boston, Berlin (1992).

[14] R. T. Powers, *A nonspatial continuous semigroup of $*$-endomorphisms of $B(H)$,* Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. 23 (1987), 1053-1069.

[15] R.T. Powers, *New examples of continuous spatial semigroups of endomorphisms of $B(H)$,* Int. J. Math. 10 (2):215-288, (1999).

[16] G. L. Price, B. M. Baker, P. E. T. Jorgensen and P. S. Muhly (Editors), *Advances in Quantum Dynamics*, (South Hadley, MA, 2002) Contemp. Math. 335, Amer. Math. Society, Providence, RI (2003).

[17] Y. Shalom, *Harmonic analysis, cohomology, and the large-scale geometry of amenable groups.* Acta Math. **192** (2004), 119–185.

[18] B. Tsirelson, *Non-isomorphic product systems.* Advances in Quantum Dynamics (South Hadley, MA, 2002), 273–328, Contemp. Math., 335, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2003.

[19] B. Tsirelson, *Spectral densities describing off-white noises.* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. **38** (2002), 1059–1069.

[20] K. Yosida, *Functional Analysis.* Sixth edition. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1980.

[21] K. H. Zhu, *Operator Theory in Function Spaces.* Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, 139. Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1990.

Department of Mathematics,, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.
E-mail address: `izumi@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`

Chennai Mathematical Institute, Siruseri 603103, India.
E-mail address: `vasanth@cmi.ac.in`